

# C o n t e n t s

	Page
Bibliography	1
Elizabethan	1
Historical	4
	23
	41
THE RELATION OF HOOKER'S "ECCLESIASTICAL	44
POLITY" TO PURITANISM IN THE	53
REIGN OF ELIZABETH.	58
-----	62
Thesis by	77
Robert R. Turner, M.A. Edin.	93
Vans Dunlop Scholar in History 1923-26.	103
-----	114
	142
	163
	182

# C o n t e n t s

	Page
Bibliography	1
Elizabethan Puritans	1
Historical Introduction	4
Notes	33
Puritan Numbers	41
Notes on Puritan Supporters	46
The Literary Aspect of the Puritan Controversy	53
Primary Assumptions	58
The Problem: Church and State	62
Notes	77
Guiding Principles in the Controversy	93
Notes	103
The Seat of Authority	114
Notes	142
The Ultimate Issue	163
Notes	182

Notes .. .. . 182  
[Paraphrase of Norwich] the other from Beza to  
A.D. Bishop of L. [Orlando of London]. 28 leaves  
printed on both sides (recto and verso) and paginated  
A 1 to viii; B 1 to viii; C 1 to viii; and D 1 to iv.  
Cited as "A. Par. 1."

"An Exposition to the Synode to deal Brotherly with  
 their Synod. Bibliography to the Bishops  
 and their of ----- book [etc.]"  
 Published with the "Admonition" in 1572. A preface  
 of two leaves separately paged, followed by 10  
 leaves - A i to iv; B i to iv; C i and ii. Anony-

"Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity" by Richard  
 Hooker. Edited by John Keble. Quotations from  
 a two-volume edition (Oxford 1885). Cited as  
 "Hooker, E.P." with references to Book, Section,  
 and Paragraph as numbered.

"A Replie to an answer made of M. Doctor Whitgift.  
 Against The Admonition to the Parliament." By  
 T.C. [Thomas Cartwright]. Probably published  
 1573. Citations from the second impression.  
 Cited as "T.C.I.".

"The second replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst  
 Maister Doctor Whitgiftes second answer touching  
 the Church Discipline. MDLXXV". Cited as  
 "T.C.II".

"A Full and Plaine Declaration of Ecclesiastical Dis-  
 cipline owt off the word off God, and off the  
 declininge off the church off England from the  
 same".

[Cartwright's Translation of the Latin work  
 "Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae et Anglicanae Ecclesiae  
 ab illa Aberrationis plena e verbo Dei et dilucida  
 explicatio"].

Universally ascribed to Walter Travers; with a  
 preface by the translator. Citations from the 1580  
 Geneva edition. Cited as "Eccles. Disc.".

"An Admonition to the Parliament". Anonymous. Publish-  
 ed in 1572: by John Field and Thomas Wilcox or  
 Wilcocks. Includes at the end of the pamphlet two  
 letters, one from Gualter to D.J.P. Bishop of N.,  
 [Parkhurst of Norwich] the other from Beza to  
 E.G. Bishop of L. [Grindal of London]. 28 leaves  
 printed on both sides (recto and verso) and paginated  
 A i to viii; B i to viii; C i to viii; and D i to iv.  
 Cited as "Ad. Parlt.".

in his words for the govern-  
 ment of his Church, in all times and places, untill  
 the end of the world". By John Udall. First issued  
 in 1588, printed by Waldegrave at East Molsey [Ox.  
 Arber's Reprint]. Reprinted in 1598 along with "A  
 parte etc." but with separate paging. Cited as  
 "Dea. Disc.".

"An Exhortation to the Byshops to deal Brotherly with theyr Brethren" and "An Exhortation to the Bishops and their clergie to answer a little booke [etc.]". Published with the "Admonition" in 1572. A preface of two leaves separately paged, followed by 10 leaves - A i to iv; B i to iv; C i and ii. Anonymous. Cited as "Exhort."

"A Second(e) Admonition to the Parliament". Anonymous. Published in London in 1572. Four leaves of Preface, numbered i to iv, and 64 pages of pamphlet, the first eight unnumbered, 9 to 64 paginated normally. Cited as "Second Adm."

[This work has usually been ascribed to Cartwright's pen. Mr Scott Pearson (p.74) adduces strong evidence in opposition to the traditional view. It is noticeable that Hooker always ascribes only the "Replies" to T.C., distinguishing their three separate divisions as i, ii and iii].

"Certaine Articles, collected and taken (as it is thought) by the Byshops out of a little booke entitled an Admonition to the Parliament/with an Answer to the same. Containing a confirmation of the sayde Booke in shorte notes." Anonymous. 1572 or 1573. Cited as "Articles".

[Citations from the "Admonition", the "Exhortations", the "Second Admonition", and the "Articles", are taken from a volume in which all are bound together. This volume, in Cambridge University Library, (Syn. 8.57.75) has a verse inscribed on the fly leaf signed by "Jo Feilde"].

"A parte of a register, contayninge sundrie memorable matters, written by divers godly and learned in our time, which stande for, and desire the reformation of our Church, in Discipline and Ceremonies, according to the pure worde of God, and the Lawe of our Lande." Printed by Waldegrave in Scotland in 1593. Cited as "A parte etc."

"A Demonstration of the trueth of that Discipline which Christ hath prescribed in his worde for the gouernment of his Church, in all times and places, vntill the end of the world". By John Udall. First issued in 1588, printed by Waldegrave at East Molesey [Cf. Arber's Reprint]. Reprinted in 1593 along with "A parte etc." but with separate paging. Cited as "Dem. Disc."



"The Seconde Parte of a Register". Being a Calendar of MSS. under that title intended for publication by the Puritans about 1593, and now in Dr Williams' Library, London. Edited by Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D. [Camb. Univ. Press 1915, 2 Vols]. Cited as "2nd Part Reg.". [These MSS. have usually been referred to as the Morrice MSS. Dr Peel includes (Vol. I, pp. 30-33) a valuable and informative index to "A parte etc."]

"'Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae', by John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury. MDLXII". Parker Society Edition of Jewel's "Works", Volume III [Cambridge 1848]. Cited as 'Jewel "Apol."'.  
 Disputations

"The Defense of the Answer to the Admonition, against the Replie of T.C." by John Whitgift, 1574. Parker Society Edition: Three Volumes [Cambridge 1851-53]. Cited as "Whitgift I, II and III".

"Zurich Letters" (First and Second Series). Published by the Parker Society. First Series cited as "Zurich Letters I". [Cambridge 1842 and 45].

"Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents illustrative of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I." Edited by G.W. Prothero [4th Edition: Oxford 1913]. Cited as 'Prothero "Documents"'.  
 Cited as

"Tudor Constitutional Documents". Edited by J.R. Tanner. [Cambridge 1922]. Cited as "Tanner T.C.D.".

Articles in the "Dictionary of National Biography".

"Robert Browne" by Rev. A. Jessopp, D.D.

"Thomas Cartwright" by J.B. Mullinger.

"Richard Hooker" by Sir Sidney Lee.

"Walter Travers" by Miss C. Fell Smith.

"John Whitgift" by Sir Sidney Lee.

Cited as "D.N.B.".

Articles in the "Cambridge Modern History".

Vol. II: "The Helvetic Reformation" by Rev. J.P. Whitney, M.A.

"Calvin and the Reformed Church" by Rev. A.M. Fairbairn, D.D.

"The Reformation under Edward VI" by A.F. Pollard, M.A.

"The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation" by F.W. Maitland, LL.D.

Vol. III: "The Last Years of Elizabeth" by Sir  
Sidney Lee, Litt.D.  
Cited as "C.M.H."

"Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' Book V". Edited by  
Ronald Bayne for the English Theological Library.  
Prints (in modern spelling) George Cranmer's letter  
to Hooker in 1596 or 1598, and the "Christian  
Letter" of 1599. Cited as 'Bayne "Book Five"'.  
-----

"The Early English Dissenters" by Champlin Burrage.  
[Camb. Univ. Press, 1912. Two Volumes]. Vol. I  
cited as 'Burrage "Dissenters"'.  
-----

"The History of English Nonconformity", Vol. I, by  
Henry W. Clark. Cited as 'Clark "Nonconformity"'.  
-----

"A History of the English Church in the reigns of  
Elizabeth and James I" by W.H. Frere. Cited as  
'Frere "History"'. [Macmillan's Series: London 1904].  
-----

"An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's 'Ecclesias-  
tical Polity'" by W. Paget. [Oxford 1899]. Cited  
as 'Paget "Introd."'.

"A History of England from 1547-1603" by A.F. Pollard.  
[Longmans' Series: London 1910]. Cited as  
'Pollard "History"'.  
-----

"Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism" by  
Rev. A.F. Scott Pearson. [Camb. 1925] Cited as  
"Scott Pearson".  
-----

"The Reconstruction of the English Church", Volume I.  
by R.G. Usher. [Appleton and Co. London 1910].  
Cited as 'Usher "Recons."'.

"The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth"  
by R.G. Usher. [Camden Society. London 1905].  
Cited as 'Usher "Pres. Movement"'.  
-----

(x) Cf. Paget "Introd.", pp. 10-11.

## ELIZABETHAN PURITANS

Nicknames given to groups or parties by their opponents have not infrequently become accepted and even honourable titles among subsequent generations. Such is the history of the word Puritan. In the first decade of Elizabeth's reign it came to be attached to certain men who regarded in a particular way the Elizabethan Church settlement. These men rejected the designation, which had for them evil and slighting associations, and for many years the majority of the group to which the word was applied tried to free themselves from it. Nevertheless the modern historian need not hesitate to apply the term even to those who so indignantly rejected it, for no other title can be given to which greater objections do not apply, and the heirs of Elizabethan Puritanism have themselves accepted the name and given it honour<sup>x</sup>.

Under the heading of Puritan there are several different types to be distinguished. When the name was first coined it was applied to men who disliked what they termed "relics of Popery" in the orders of service of the Church

---

(x) Cf. Paget "Introd.", pp. 10-14.

of England, as established by the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity<sup>x</sup>, and explained more fully in the Injunctions issued in the same year, 1559, as the passing of these measures<sup>§</sup>. The demands presented to Convocation in 1563 represent the platform of this party<sup>+</sup>.

The defeat of these aims, and the clearer definition of the position of the Establishment, naturally led to a development in Puritanism. From demands for mere alteration of a ceremony or two, or the abandonment of some garment or rite, some passed to an agitation for reforming the whole framework of Ecclesiastical administration by substituting a Presbyterian in place of the existing Episcopal system, with radical changes in ecclesiastical practices and worship. These did not separate themselves, however, from fellowship with the Church of England. They still remained within its fold as members or ministers. From about 1570 onwards the word Puritan was applied to men of this school, of which Cartwright was the leading representative. Such was the Puritanism characteristic of the reign of Elizabeth: it was this against which Hooker directed his arguments.

---

(x) 1 Eliz. Caps. 1 and 2.

(§) Cf. Prothero "Documents", pp. 184-190.

(+) op.cit. p.191.



The name Puritan is also often given to quite a different section of those who desired to alter the religious settlement of 1559. Conformity with and acceptance of a church which was in any way imperfectly reformed was offensive to certain more extreme persons. So when it became clear that the Church of England was not going to set itself in order in accordance with their views there were a few who cut themselves off from that church altogether and would have no fellowship with it. It is best to keep the name of Separatist for these extremists, and reserve the title of Puritan for those who still counted themselves members of the national church. There are border-line cases, but the general distinction should be maintained. The Separatists were in the reign of Elizabeth always a very small minority, but they were important both in their bearing on the attitude of the Church of England towards the Puritans, and, outside the period, in their developments in subsequent history. On the continent of Europe, as later in Scotland, the motive power of the religious changes was supplied from below, from among the people, but in England the direction and control were from above, by the rulers of the country.

---

(x) Pollard in C.M.H., Vol. II, pp. 478, 479.

## HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

"The Reformation in England was divergent in origin, method, and aim from all the phases of the movement abroad; it left the English Church without a counterpart in Europe. .... It was in its main aspect practical and not doctrinal; it concerned itself less with dogma than with conduct, and its favourite author was Erasmus, not because he preached any distinctive theology, but because he lashed the evil practices of the Church. ...

"The Reformation in England was mainly a domestic affair, a national protest against national grievances rather than part of a cosmopolitan movement towards doctrinal change. ... It was an ecclesiastical counterpart of the growth of nationality at the expense of the mediaeval ideal of the unity of the civilized world."<sup>x</sup>

The course of the Reformation in England was unique. On the continent of Europe, as later in Scotland, the motive power of the religious changes was supplied from below, from among the people, but in England the direction and control were from above, by the rulers of the country.

---

(x) Pollard in C.M.H., Vol. II, pp. 478, 479.

Moreover the first stages of the breach with Rome were due, not to doctrinal differences, but to political and personal considerations. Thus the history of the English Church was given a characteristic bias, which it never lost in the later Tudor period. Crown control, based very considerably on political interests, was the dominating factor, and continued to be dominant until the end of Elizabeth's reign. In England there seems to have been on the whole an attitude of indifference on the part of the majority of the population towards the deeper things of religion. The changes made between 1530 and 1560 encountered strong opposition only when they became extreme, and upset the accustomed order. Fundamental principles were not of great importance.

The effect on the English Church of Henry VIII's breach with Rome was to transfer the prerogatives of the Papacy in England to the Crown. The organisation of the church was not appreciably altered: its hierarchy of officials, its courts, its law continued to exist as before; but beyond the Archbishop of Canterbury, where crown and papacy had held a joint tenure of ecclesiastical supremacy, their proportionate importance varying with changes of circumstance and personalities, there now stood as Supreme Head of the Church in England the King.

The mediaeval conflict between the secular and the ecclesiastical powers ended in a very definite victory for the secular power, which in the Tudor period may without hesitation be termed the State. Henry VIII added to his powers as king the powers over the church previously held by the Pope. This meant a double loss to the church: not only had the king gained new powers, but he had secured them at the expense of the national church, inasmuch as it was no longer possible to play off Pope against king.

None of these changes necessarily affected doctrine, but it soon became clear that it was impossible to maintain severance from Rome in combination with the profession of Roman doctrine. So the English Church tended to move in theology towards the positions of European protestantism. When Henry's firm hand was removed the changes became pronounced, and the breach with Rome extended to doctrine and ceremonies. The influences of Zurich and Geneva were strong in the later years of Edward VI's brief reign, but on the death of the young king it became clear that the Earl of Warwick had completely outstripped popular opinion in the protestant campaign which he had undertaken on political and personal grounds. England cheerfully returned to its old faith



and allegiance under Mary. A new Parliament undid most of the work of its predecessors during the previous quarter century, but it refused to attempt to restore to the church the property lost in the dissolution of the monasteries. Mary could not altogether put back the hands of the clock, nor did she succeed in stamping out the protestantism which had made good its footing within the country. Many of the leading reformers escaped to the continent of Europe: several of their followers in different parts of the country managed to meet in small congregations, as in London, and at Stoke in Suffolk.<sup>⌘</sup> It was Mary's misfortune to do more for the ultimate triumph of the Reformation in England than Warwick himself could have done. Her marriage with Philip of Spain, the subservience of her foreign policy to Spanish interests, the military catastrophe of the reign. (the loss of Calais) and the consequent impoverishment of a country whose exchequer was already depleted, combined with the execution of sundry heretics, gave to her religion evil associations in the eyes of the majority of her subjects, who were probably more anxious for the strength and prosperity of England than animated by religious fervour. *her hand, and she played them with consummate skill.*

---

(⌘) cf. Burrage "Dissenters", Vol. I, pp. 70-73.

So Elizabeth came to the throne with a number of circumstances in her favour, notwithstanding the dismal national and international outlook. She knew she could count on the favour of Spain while the Franco-Scottish alliance continued. That had been sealed by the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots to the Dauphin, who succeeded to the throne of France as Francis II soon after Elizabeth's accession. Thus Elizabeth had a foothold in the affairs of Europe. At home she received the support of all good Englishmen. She was the last in the direct line of the popular Tudor dynasty: she was thoroughly English by birth: her accession ended the detested Spanish alliance forged by her sister: she had not committed herself to any person nor to any policy, but had remained discreetly in the background during the preceding reign. Moreover, hers was the only life between the nation and an appalling succession problem. Mary Queen of Scots was the nearest heir to the throne by birth, and her accession would tie England to the chariot wheels of France even more firmly than Mary Tudor had bound England to Spain. Although Elizabeth's position was difficult in the extreme, there were a number of strong cards in her hand, and she played them with consummate skill.

The details of the first anxious years of the reign need not be set forth at length. A policy of rest and restoration at home was adopted. Abroad Elizabeth did nothing rashly nor in haste, and gradually her temporizing policy abundantly justified itself. In ecclesiastical affairs the Queen and her immediate counsellors, chief among whom was William Cecil, soon to be Lord Burghley, determined what was to be done without consulting what ecclesiastical opinion. Elizabeth was not going to have less than her father, and though she surrendered the title 'Supreme Head' she retained the reality behind it. She determined to be mistress of the church organisation: doctrine was a matter of secondary importance to her, though she seems to have had leanings to Rome. It has been said that "the guiding and inspiring idea of Elizabeth's ecclesiastical policy was really to settle religious affairs in such a fashion that they should count as living and burning interests no more"<sup>κ</sup>. "To the Queen all zeal or fanaticism was obnoxious"<sup>§</sup>. So her religious settlement was designed to prevent religious questions from becoming supreme in England, and the experience of

---

(κ) Clark, 'Nonconformity', Vol. I, p.156.

(§) Lee in C.M.H., Vol. III, p.340. homogeneous unity

there must be some bond of practical value and definiteness

other countries, notably France, gave to her attitude a practical justification. But it was foreseen that even the liberal elastic settlement devised could not satisfy everyone: the "Device for the Alteration of Religion", a scheme of policy sketched soon after the Queen's accession, probably by Cecil, foreshadowed the main problems of the Church of England during the reign. The re-adoption of the earlier Edwardine position - which was what was in view, and which was accomplished in the first Parliament of the reign - would be obnoxious both to sincere Romanists and to those who had fled from Mary to the Continent and had there developed more advanced views according to the teaching of Zurich or Geneva. It was an accurate forecast: for the remainder of the century the Church was attacked, on one side by the Papists, who came to be known as recusants, on the other by more extreme protestants, who won for themselves the nickname of Puritans or Precise Folk. No definition of the church could have included both these, and in spite of the wide basis of the Church's position and the absence of inquisition into private opinions, extremists of both colours proved irreconcilable.

To form a number of men into a homogeneous unity there must be some bond of practical value and definiteness



of meaning. Vague formulae may have a wide range of acceptance, but make little claim on loyalty. It soon became clear to the new ecclesiastical leaders, who included a number of men of sincere religious convictions, that the Church required closer definition if it was to be a church at all. So the Thirty-nine Articles were drafted in the Convocation of 1563 and issued with crown authority<sup>x</sup>. Like considerations caused the party that sought further reformation to present certain demands to the same meeting of convocation, dealing with points in ritual and in ceremonial clothing which were distasteful to them<sup>s</sup>. There was precedent for such opinions. Hooper in Edward VI's reign had shown great distaste for the episcopal vestments and had consequently long resisted his own elevation to the see of Gloucester. The practices to which the Puritans objected made the services of the reformed Church very similar in many ways to the Roman Mass. That fact was however one reason for their enforcement by the Queen. She intended to conciliate the Catholics, who were probably still the majority among her subjects, whatever advanced reformers might think. It seems clear that she herself approved of ritualism, but she

---

(x) The present 29th Article was withheld till 1571 through the Queen's opposition to it.  
 (§) cf. Prothero "Documents", p.191.

left the problems of ecclesiastical discipline to the bishops, who were guided and inspired by Archbishop Parker. The task was not easy. A number of important clergymen held the advanced views, and those of the bishops who had, during Mary's reign, come into contact with the influences of Geneva or Zurich, were not unsympathetic<sup>(1)</sup>. In the Lower House of Convocation the Puritan demands were rejected by a margin of only one vote after proxies had been counted: a majority of those actually present were favourable to them. In spite of this rebuff the Puritans continued their activities in London and the Home Counties, and so much variation in ecclesiastical practices was caused that the Archbishop, in order to give any meaning to the Act of Uniformity, was forced to take action<sup>x</sup>. The Queen did not give him her official support, but after some time he issued on his own authority the "Advertisements" of 1566, to define more exactly standard practice. The ecclesiastical Courts also took steps to deal with the Puritanising ministers. This led to the first clear breach with the Established Church on the part of a few Londoners, who formed themselves into a separate church under the ministry of one Richard Fitz. Another group of Puritans, who

---

(x) cf. Frere "History", p.115.

seem to have been of the true non-separatist type, met in the Plumbers' Hall until discovered by the authorities.<sup>(x)</sup> The enforcement of the new rules showed that those of the bishops who had once had scruples over the obnoxious ceremonies and garments, such as Jewel, had now swallowed their objections and were supporting the crown settlement of religion<sup>(§)</sup>. It was a sore point with the Puritans<sup>(2)</sup>.

This defeat in the preliminary encounter led naturally to a closer definition and a clearer basis for Puritanism. Many, like Bishop Jewel, were not prepared to withstand the government and overcame their scruples. There must have been a certain number, impossible to estimate, of this type of Puritan in England for the rest of the reign, but they did not figure in public affairs. So long as their political opinions were respected by the crown, and their ecclesiastical predilections not overstrained, such men would not be disobedient to the crown for the sake of what they considered small matters of religion. They had no quarrel with episcopacy, nor did they question the Royal Supremacy.

The fate of the vestments controversy showed that more would be at stake in future disputes. More fire was

---

(x) cf. Burrage "Dissenters", Vol. I, pp. 79-86.

(§) Zurich Letters I, No. 24, p. 55.

(2) Cambridge.

required if the Puritan movement was to make further headway, and it was forthcoming. The new developments were heralded by the appearance on the scene of Thomas Cartwright. He was a man of much learning and extensive knowledge, who had made a name for himself at his university<sup>x</sup>. His scholarship was widely recognised and appreciated, and he had just been appointed to the Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity. Subsequently the universities of St Andrews and Leyden sought for his services, and Walsingham secured for him the task of preparing the official confutation of the seditious productions of Jesuit seminaries, in particular the Douai or Rheims translation of the New Testament. Even Archbishop Whitgift did not oppose this appointment till he learned something of the ecclesiastical tone of the work. Cartwright had an extensive acquaintance with the works of the Early Fathers of the Church, and was well abreast of the developments in thought of his own time. However, with all his scholarship Cartwright combined a sincere belief in Puritan principles of an advanced order. In his first course of lectures as Professor his ecclesiastical views were soon proclaimed. This brought him into conflict with Whitgift, then vice-chancellor of the university. Cambridge had proved itself, and continued to be, a hot-bed of Puritanism, and Whitgift

---

(x) Cambridge.



was doing all he could to suppress the dangerous doctrines. Cartwright was baffled, silenced, and eventually deprived not only of his chair but of his fellowship. After the Puritans had met with another rebuff in the Parliament of 1571 through the Queen's sturdy resistance to attempted ecclesiastical legislation which was inspired by neither crown nor bishops, Cartwright took a leading part in publishing in print the platform of the new Puritanism. His learning, position, and enthusiasm made him the chief Puritan protagonist. He had just visited Geneva. There he had seen in operation a system which promised absolute security against Romish and other abuses. Such a system, with a clearly defined basis and position, was what he conceived England to need, so he pressed still more vigorously his advocacy of Presbyterianism. The first two tracts of the new Puritanism were not, however, from his pen. "An Admonition to the Parliament", which appeared anonymously during the first session of Elizabeth's 4th Parliament in 1572, was the work of two London ministers, John Field and Thomas Wilcox. It proved distinctly popular and very offensive to the government, and anonymity did not save its authors from imprisonment. It was soon supplemented by a few additional pamphlets and a "Second Admonition". Whitgift hastened to defend the Church of England

against the attack, and Cartwright took up the cudgels on behalf of the Puritans. He translated a scholarly and influential treatise by Walter Travers, who was second only to Cartwright among the Puritans, - "Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae .... explicatio" - and also replied extensively to Whitgift. For some years an argument on paper was maintained between the two adversaries. The last volume of the controversy came from Cartwright in 1577, having been written abroad, as its author had then spent four years in exile. Hooker's work was in effect a continuation of the controversy after a long interval. The opinions of Cartwright were most constantly in his mind; Cartwright's writings were those which he most frequently cited and opposed. So a somewhat fuller study of the circumstances during the period of Cartwright's chief literary activity is necessary and desirable.

In 1572, and during the subsequent years, the position of England was very insecure. Roman Catholicism was a real and serious danger. In Europe it had set its house in order at the Council of Trent and had launched a Counter-Reformation which was making rather alarming headway. Less than three years earlier there had been a rising, in the interests of the old religion, in the north of England against the Elizabethan régime and church. The

presence of Mary Stuart in England was a constant invitation to Catholics to plot against Elizabeth, and Spanish intrigue was active, as had become apparent with the discovery of the Ridolfi intrigue. The Pope, by the issue of the Bull "Regnans in Excelsis", had made it impossible consistently to combine sincere Catholicism with genuine patriotism. In France and the Netherlands the reformed religion was in sore straits: in Scotland, though triumphant, it was far from secure. In the very year of the 'Admonitions' the massacres of St Bartholomew at Paris and elsewhere in France stirred all Protestantism and gave further cause for alarm. The Church of Rome, backed by the puissance of the Hapsburgs, seemed well on the way to re-engulfing all Europe.

Against the Church of Rome the Church of England seemed but a feeble bulwark. Its poor state at the time was revealed in many quarters. Many of its ministers in 1572 were men who valued religion so cheaply that they had conformed with equal facility under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. There was much ignorance and much dereliction of duty. Discipline was lax, and moral standards too often low<sup>(3)</sup>. A number of the bishops were quite unworthy of their position. Elizabeth found the church a

(+) Fisher, "Recons.", p. 6.

valuable means of revenue, and having, secured a few able instruments of her will in high places, used the rest of the offices at her disposal to line her pocket, either by taking the income of a diocese during its vacancy, or by securing a few pickings from the new holder before allowing him to enter upon his charge<sup>x</sup>. Small wonder that there was a general tendency to avarice ! Aylmer, when bishop of London, could not find funds to repair St Paul's, and complained of his great financial burdens, but he left a landed estate worth £16,000 when he died<sup>s</sup>. The church was ill able to bear such exactions: it had lost heavily in the process of reformation, and was poor and weak<sup>(4)</sup>. Even at the end of the reign "the great problem which faced the Church in the year 1603 was not so much the diversity of doctrinal opinion as the poverty, ignorance, and disobedience of its clergy, and the lack of any efficient administration capable of coercing them into obedience."<sup>+</sup> Admittedly there was a very strong case for better reformation. Many who saw these evils thought of the "good old days" and would not have opposed a return to Rome.

---

(x) cf. Frere 'History', p.191.

(s) cf. 2nd Part. Reg., Vol. I, p.248 and Usher, "Recons.", p.115.

(+) Usher, "Recons.", p.6.



Again, the discipline of the Church, exercised by the Bishops and the Ecclesiastical courts, rested on a peculiarly complex basis:- "The lawes of the lande / the booke of common prayer / the Queenes Iniunctions / the Commissioners advertisements / the bishops late Canons / Lindwoodes Provincials / every bishops Articles in his diocesse / my lord of Canterburies sober caveats / in his licences to preachers / and hys highe Courte of Prerogative or grave fatherly faculties."<sup>x</sup> It was not difficult to find discrepancies and lack of agreement between the various codes: what authority then did the Church of England or its bishops really possess? It was weak within and weak without, while Rome was strong and daily increasing. In these circumstances it seemed folly to retain so much of Rome in the church: the Puritans urged that Papistry should be shunned and altogether expelled. Any toleration of Romish practices seemed an encouragement to Rome to further efforts, and the Puritans could find no name bad enough for the Pope or his religion, although they had no lack of abusive epithets in their vocabulary. Their vehemence in this direction blinded them to the true strength of their plea for reformation: they had a very strong case, but spoilt it by misplacing

---

(x) Second Adm., p.7.

the emphasis. The causes of the weakness of the Church of England were not its ceremonies, but poverty, abuse of lay patronage, from which the crown was not free, loss of episcopal power, and a general absence of spiritual fervour.

Nevertheless the Church of England was not spiritually dead. From about 1570 or 1571 efforts were being made in several dioceses to foster the study of the Bible and elevate the standard of learning and discipline among the clergy by means of the meetings of ministers known as Prophesyings or Exercises. Many of the bishops at first supported the movement, and gave it recognition in the church by issuing regulations for the proper ordering of the gatherings.<sup>x</sup> The exercises were practised at assemblies of the ministers of a district, held at regular intervals in some convenient centre. A moderator presided, and all who took part had to sign a Protestant confession of faith. At each meeting some selected passage of Scripture was discussed. Laymen might be present, and often were in considerable numbers, but were usually not allowed to speak. Occasionally the clergy might meet in private for mutual exhortation, and, if needed, censure.

---

(x) cf. Prothero, "Documents", pp.202-204.

The Prophesyings seem to have been an honest attempt to meet a real need, but they were dangerously open to Puritan propagandists. They resembled closely the 'Conferences' of the Puritan scheme of organisation<sup>(5)</sup>. Cartwright had already shown at Cambridge how impossible it was for a sincere Puritan to discuss Scripture without criticising the Church of England as established. The Queen, always suspicious of public discussion of important matters, seems to have regarded the Exercises doubtfully from the first, and when it became clear in 1574 that the Puritans were misusing them in the diocese of Norwich she ordered Archbishop Parker to put an end to the meetings<sup>x</sup>. When Grindal became Archbishop two years later he tried to secure their continuance in a harmless form by issuing strict anti-Puritan regulations for their direction<sup>§</sup>, but the Queen was more anxious to muzzle Puritanism than to educate the rural clergy, and Grindal's defence of the Prophesyings earned for him only suspension from his duties. Thus did Puritanism make the task of the government more difficult, and divert the energy which might have been spent in reforming the Church spiritually into defending it as it was.

---

(x) cf. Prothero, "Documents", p.204.

(§) cf. op.cit. pp.204;205.

Such then was the setting of the work of Cartwright, Travers, and their colleagues. Their fears of Rome were not ungrounded: they had a very strong case in the abuses which existed within the church, but they misread several features of the situation and obscured the strength of their plea in a fog of abusive and dogmatic declarations. If the Puritan movement had depended on its printed platform it could hardly have met with the success it apparently did attain. When it came to actual work among the people Puritan zeal and earnestness must have been impressive where the regular incumbent of a parish was ignorant or worse. This state of affairs is the practical justification at the time of Puritanism. An interesting commentary on the whole subject is to be found in "An acte for the reformation of the Ministerie in the Church of England and for the supplyinge of the same with convenient and sufficient ministers"<sup>x</sup>, a moderate Puritan document which made some effort to deal with the really crying needs of the English Church.

Some eight years elapsed between the end of the Cartwright-Whitgift controversy and the incident which caused Hooker to set about his monumental task. During these

---

(x) 2nd Part Reg. Vol. I, Doc. No. 183, pp.304-311.



years there had been a lull in the conflict, as Grindal's misfortunes as Archbishop rather disorganised ecclesiastical government. But there had also been developments in both lines of attack on the Via Media. For the Catholics, the invasion of seminarist priests from Douai and Rheims had begun, and had been reinforced by the Jesuit mission headed by Campion and Parsons. Puritans, denied the use of open Prophesyings, were in secret developing a Presbyterian organisation throughout a large part of England. They sought to reform from within gradually, without "present severance", and were able to combine their schemes with "the holding of a benefice and with outward conformity more or less complete. In Fuller's phrase 'the grand design was ... to set up a discipline in a discipline, presbytery in episcopacy' - a design which probably took form by degrees, but which came to be a very definite, practical and effective organisation for getting the Puritan platform into the established framework with the hope that presently the latter might disappear and the former take its place"<sup>x</sup>. Regular conferences or "classes" of "ministers and of selected men not in orders" were being held in many districts "for the

---

(x) Paget, "Introd.", pp.63, 64.

study of the Scriptures, for fasts, and for exercising control over one another in all matters of conduct<sup>x</sup> on the lines of the forbidden Exercises. These classes or local synods began to send representatives to larger synods, and by the time Hooker was writing there had been held synods which could be termed national, as representative of Puritans in all parts of the country. Within this organisation the characteristic practices of Presbyterianism could be followed. Matters of church order and discipline were discussed, recommendations passed, statistics collected, and arrangements made for the drafting and presenting of petitions to the Crown and to ministers of state<sup>(6)</sup>. In a number of ways episcopal authority was circumvented, though care was taken to keep within the strict letter of the law as far as possible. Hooker had direct experience of Puritan methods while he was Master of the Temple. There, apparently, there were churchwardens chosen who also acted as Puritan "elders"<sup>+</sup>. His refusal to agree to Puritan practices was followed by the famous controversy on Puritan theory, of which the Temple Church was the scene, and Hooker and Travers the protagonists.

---

(x) Usher, "Pres. Movement", p.xx.

(6) Cf. the Puritan "Registers".

(+) Cf. "The Answer to Travers' Supplication".

after 1589, and threw down a defiant gauntlet to the

This dispute set Hooker to examine the position of the Church of England, to investigate afresh with greater explicitness the line of reasoning he had already been following, and to attempt a complete answer to the Puritans with all the skill and power of argument at his command. But Hooker's background of contemporary fact was not that of Cartwright at the time of the 'Admonitions' and the controversy with Whitgift. The years 1587-8 may be termed the crisis of Elizabeth's reign. The struggle with Roman Catholicism represented by Spain, constantly foreshadowed for twenty-five years, came at last, and with the victory of England every Protestant in Europe breathed more freely. From that date the Catholic peril rapidly diminished, though recusancy continued to meet with more severe persecution for a time. English Catholics had proved that on the whole they were English before they were Catholic. The claims of Mary Queen of Scots had descended to James VI of Scotland, at the moment a Protestant, though of rather doubtful constancy. The Church of England too was proving its ability to stand as it had been defined. Whitgift was busily infusing new vigour into administration, with able assistance from Bancroft after 1589, and threw down a defiant gauntlet to the

Puritans. Still more important was the fact that a new generation was growing up to whom "the Church" meant the Church of England as it stood: it was becoming respected and loved. "The Elizabethan religion ... appeared as part and parcel of a general amelioration. It was allied with honest money, cheap and capable government, national independence, and a reviving national pride".<sup>x</sup> "The growth of England's trade and commerce, and the consequent prosperity, (despite distress in places), the great wave of patriotism rising from the defeat of the Spanish Armada, the widespread reverence and love for Elizabeth, the love of things English because they were English, - all contributed to turn this popular indifference into a real pride and love for the Established Church as an institution thoroughly and peculiarly their own."<sup>s</sup> Some of the great flood of life which so distinguishes the Elizabethan Age in the history of English Arts must have overflowed into the Church. The various efforts to reform abuses were probably beginning to tell; worship was reviving and a better type of minister appearing in many places.<sup>+</sup> Church adornment and even building recommenced.<sup>e</sup> By the time

---

(x) Maitland in C.M.H., Vol. II, p.598.

(s) Usher, "Recons.", p.281.

(+) cf. Frere, "History", p.284.

(e) cf. Hooker, E.P., V, xv.5.



Hooker was dealing with particular Puritan objections, in his Fifth book, there must have been some improvement in the general state of the church, though more was required. Besides, Puritanism was clearly apparent in the light of the past as a considerable annoyance and hindrance to the government at times of great anxiety. The attitude of the 'official class', those interested in the government, with prospects of sharing in its duties, was indicated by George Cranmer in a letter to Hooker at the time. "Now of late years the heat of men towards the Discipline is greatly decayed; their judgments begin to sway on the other side; the learned have weighed it and found it light; wise men conceive some fear, lest it prove not only not the best kind of government, but the very bane and destruction of all government."<sup>§</sup> The great Puritan campaigns (1572-4 and 1584-8) had coincided with particularly anxious moments when the government desired to be free to deal with foreign affairs and problems. Puritanism had distracted the ecclesiastical authorities and prevented them from attending to their proper functions in church government. It had hindered that reconciliation with the moderate Catholics which had been the great object

---

~~(\*) Hooker, B.P., V, lxxvi, 8.~~  
~~(\*) Hooker, B.P., V, lxxvi, 8.~~

(§) In Bayne "Book Five", p.579.

of the Church settlement - that tempering of "rigour with lenity that neither extreme severity might utterly cut them off in whom there was manifest hope of amendment, nor yet the easiness of pardoning offences embolden offenders".<sup>x</sup>

Indeed Puritanism had tended to alienate Catholics and contributed indirectly to such success as the Romanist missionaries had won. The buffoonery of Martin Marprelate, deemed dangerous to all law and order, though disowned by the Puritan leaders had come from the Puritan camp. By the end of the century Puritanism had become as serious a problem to the government as recusancy: its logical results seemed to be demonstrated in Separatism and anarchical tendencies.<sup>§</sup> It was impossible to forget that Knox and Goodman, who had advocated a divine right of rebellion against idolatrous (i.e. Catholic) princes,<sup>+</sup> were of that school of Geneva which the Puritans favoured. Sacrilege and destruction seemed to be encouraged by the Puritan tenets and by their disputes<sup>e</sup>. Against this background, and with constant regard to it, Hooker raised the great edifice of the "Ecclesiastical Polity". He had been exposed to Puritan influences in his college days; his tutor,

---

(x) Hooker, E.P., V, lxxvi, 8.

(§) cf. Hooker, E.P. Pref. viii; Scott Pearson, p.359.

(+) cf. Scott Pearson, p.462.

(e) cf. Hooker, Ded. to Bk V, § 8.

Reynolds, was later one of the Puritan protagonists at the Hampton Court conference, but was not of the more combative school of Cartwright. Indeed in 1579 Hooker and his tutor suffered a short period of expulsion from their college (Corpus Christi, Oxford). "It seems probable that Hooker and his friend's views had offended John Barfoot, the vice-president, who was an ardent Puritan."<sup>x</sup> He indeed once thought "that undoubtedly such numbers of otherwise right well affected and most religiously inclined minds had some marvellous reasonable inducements, which led them with so great earnestness that way."<sup>§</sup> But in spite of his affection for Reynolds he could not agree with the arguments set forth in Puritan declarations, and developed a line of thought of his own on the matters in question. The "Ecclesiastical Polity" provided the theological and philosophical basis for the campaign of Whitgift and Bancroft against the Puritans, a campaign which had already brought about a marked change in the situation.

Elizabethan Puritanism reached its zenith about the time of the Spanish Armada, but it was already doomed to failure. From the early years of the Presbyterian campaign

---

(x) Lee in D.N.B. Article "Richard Hooker".

(§) Hooker, E.P. Pref. 1.2.

there had been internal divisions. The moderate party, headed by Cartwright, had desired conformity with episcopal demands, so as to retain the use of the pulpits. More extreme minds thought this a retraction of principles, and considered that the enduring of persecution and imprisonment for conscience sake was a more forcible argument for Puritanism than the words of a man who seemed to quibble on points of law<sup>(7)</sup>. Probably only the rise of Separatism proper kept Puritans together as a party: it is notable that they were never able fully to agree on a definite statement of principles and beliefs. Brownism confirmed Cartwright in his moderate views, and kept the bolder spirits within bounds for a time. Cartwright was able to return from abroad and to secure a living under the patronage of Leicester. But the respite was only temporary. Puritan activity was too great to be ignored, and the appearance of the Marprelate Tracts constituted a challenge to authority. The hands of the government were untied by the defeat of Spain and the Catholics, and in 1590 a number of Puritan leaders, including Cartwright, were arrested. Their imprisonment continued for over a year and a half, and though the prosecution, led by Bancroft, was unable to secure conviction on any charge, the blow was fatal. The combined influences of repressive



measures, internal disagreement, the rise of Separatism, the arguments of opponents, and the deaths of influential supporters, brought to a close the activities of the Presbyterians. With the passing of the Act of 1593 "to retain the Queen's subjects in obedience"<sup>x</sup> and the executions of Greenwood, Barrow, and Penry came "a time of silence which both parts willingly" took "to breathe"<sup>§</sup>.

So at the end of Elizabeth's reign Puritanism had become a spent force. The religious fervour of its palmy years had passed to Separatism, and was to drive men to exile in Holland and to an unhampered life in the New World. Its programme and policy were watered down until they merely expressed the aspirations of a group of indefinite size, which did not attack episcopacy, and sought only the redress of certain abuses which were admitted by all who sincerely desired the well-being of the English Church. Towards the end of his life Cartwright "changed the accent of emphasis from the destructive attitude of a revolting critic to that of a loyal, constructive, and friendly reformer. His new policy was doubtless influenced by the views of Heidelberg divines, confirmed by the emergence of Brownism, ineradicably fixed by the excesses

---

(x) 35 Eliz. Cap. 1, cf. Prothero "Documents", pp.89-92.

(§) Hooker, E.P., VI, 1.1.

of Marprelate, and dictated by his experience of the  
 futility of any other course."<sup>(8)</sup> One might venture to  
 add Hooker's published work to this list. It is incon-  
 1. ceivable that Cartwright might not have read it, and it  
 would doubtless, in the light of the other factors, pro-  
 duce some impression. It certainly had an effect on the  
 Puritan movement; it was unique.<sup>(9)</sup> The principle of  
 'Tarrying for the Magistrate' had been well enforced by  
 the lessons of Elizabeth's reign: the attitude of James,  
 2. it was to appear, finally dealt the death-blow to the  
 Puritanism of Cartwright and his school. But their  
 effort was not wholly in vain, for they fought in a great-  
 3. er battle than they knew.

---

(x) Cf. Scott Pearson, p.387.

NOTES TO HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

1. "You see me weare a coape or a surplesse in Pawles, I had rather minister without these things, but for orders sake and obedience to the Prince." [Grindal in a "conference and examination" of certain Puritans in 1567]. (A parte etc. p.30).
2. "They were once of our minde, but since their consecration they be so transubstanciated, that they are become such as you see." (Ad. Parlt. fol. A i verso.)
3. "Therefore so much the more ought we to be ashamed of our most grievous fault in this behalfe, that suffer even the most unworthie to take upon them the most waightie calling of the ministerie: and set open the Church doores to every base Artificer that leapeth from his shop bord, to the plowman that leaveth his share, to young schollers in grammer and Philosophie, that are nothing more cunning in heavenly things than Artificers and husband men: finally to minstrels and harpers, to noble and gentlemens servants, to Neateheardes, Shepherds, and porters, and sometimes not only to unlearned men, but also men of most filthie life and conversation, choosing into that most waightie office learned, and unlearned, good, and bad,

worthie, and unworthie, without aime choyse or differens." [Travers]. (Eccles. Disc. pp.59, 60).

"It is mervaille how that there be everie where so manie with us both corrupt in doctrine, and defiled in life and conversation." (op. cit. p.62).

"Howe manie also be there admitted to the government of the Church of most wicked life and ungodly behaviour?" [Travers]. (op.cit. p.63).

A "Supplication to her Matie", dated "the third yeare of her raigne or therabouts," but in style and tone belonging to a later date, complains of "the placing of ministers who are ignorant of the Scriptures ... dumb dogs and idle shepherds," "the admission of ministers of perverse and corrupt judgment, unreformed and unsound in doctrine," pluralities and non-residency. (2nd Part. Reg., Vol. I, No. 23, pp.50, 51. Cf. Frere "History", pp.58, 59, 208).

"We have on all sides lost much of our first fervency to God." [Hooker]. (Hooker E.P. Ded. of Bk V, § 2).

"That threefold blot or blemish of notable ignorance, unconscionable absence from the cures whereof men have taken charge, and insatiable hunting after spiritual preferments without either care or conscience of the public good." [Hooker]. (op.cit. V, lxxxii, 1).



4. A Summary of the woes of the English Church:-

"The multitude of parishes, the paucity of schools, the manifold discouragements which are offered unto men's inclinations that way, the penury of the ecclesiastical estate, the irrecoverable loss of so many livings of principle value clean taken away from the Church long sithence by being appropriated, the daily bruises that spiritual promotions use to take by often falling, the want of somewhat in certain statutes which concern the state of the Church, the too great facility of many bishops, the stony hardness of too many patrons' hearts not touched with any feeling in this case." [The judicious Hooker !] (Hooker E.P. V, xxxi.4).

5. "A conference I call the meeting of some certaine ministers / and other brethren / ..... at some certain place / ..... to conferre and exercise themselves in prophesying ..... At thys assembly also / the demeanours of the ministers may be examined / and rebuked ..... It is to be used continually / for the exercise of the ministers/and others / ... of their giftes in the interpretation of <sup>e</sup>y scriptures." (Second Adm. pp.29, 30).

Birchett, a Puritan

(cf. op.cit. p.114)

6. "It was thought best to the brethren ... that Mr Dowe" should settle at Stratford. (Usher "Pres. Movement", p.28).

Two were chosen to deal with another "to staie the playes of Maletree". (op.cit. p.29).

"Advise was geven by the brethren to Mr Negus tutchinge his estate and dealinge w<sup>th</sup> his people." (op.cit. p.35).

Delegates were appointed to attend a "meeting at Cambridge of diverse godlie men." (op.cit. p.50).

7. Cartwright had at first championed the London Separatist congregations (of 1567) (cf. T.C. I, p.15, and T.C. II, p.xxxviii) but declared himself a conservative Puritan very soon after his expression of these views. He had been compelled to leave England in 1573, on account of episcopal activity, and had found a temporary home in Heidelberg. The reformers in that town were very moderate in their views, and their influence seems to have been considerable in the case of Cartwright. (cf. Scott Pearson, pp.152, 153). His mind had probably been prepared by the affair of Peter Birchet, a Puritan religious fanatic, in October 1573 (cf. op.cit. p.114) and by the opinions expressed by

Beza, Calvin's successor in Geneva, (cf. Ad. Parlt. fol. D. ii verso). He was soon engaged in an epistolatory dispute with some of his brethren in England, who thoroughly disapproved of the apparent retraction of principles which their leading colleague was making (cf. "A parte etc." pp.401-408, and "2nd Part Reg.", Vol. I, Nos. 89-93, pp.136-143). Some of the leading Puritans in England wished guidance regarding the burning question of remaining in the ministry in England. Cartwright replied that the necessity of preaching overrode all other considerations. The brethren, who included "Jo. Feildus" and "Thomas Wilcocksus" denied this. "To conclude, vnles we would plainly disclaime and renounce [sic] the Lord his discipline, neither may wee enter into the Ministerie, nor being entred, long continue therein." (A parte etc." p.408). They implied that Cartwright was withdrawing from his earlier position. "Therefore in our minds it were a great [deal] better not to write any whit at all touching this point, than in your writings to set your selfe against your selfe, and against the Church and brethren also." ("2nd Part.Reg." Vol. I, p.138). "Yet we thinke it meete, that in respect both of our dulnes to good things, [and the] naughtines of the daies which are come upon us, every one, yea, the quickest amongst us, should be pricked

forward, and at no hand to go backward in the causes of God." (op.cit. Vol. I, p.139). Antony Gilby in a separate letter also adopted the uncompromising position, declaring that "This haltinge in Religion for pollicye dryveth awaye the true feare of God forth of mens hartes," (op.cit. Vol. I, p.140) and that imprisonment and deprivation and other punishments for non-compliance with the popish trappings of the ministry were in themselves testimonies as effective as sermons. (op.cit. pp.285, 286).

8. One of the last things Cartwright wrote was a letter to Yelverton asking him to "drawe a supplication to his Ma<sup>tie</sup> [i.e. James I] in the behalfe of the Nobilitie and Gentrye of that shire, as for a reformation generally of thinges amisse, so more particularly, for the removeall of th' ignorant, idle & unresident ministerye, and consequently the pluralities, the subscription other then the statute requires, the burthen of Ceremonies, the abuse of the spirituall Courtes, especially in the censures of suspension & excommunication, & the oath ex officio & such other of that kinde, your worship understandeth to be contrarye to the Lawes of the lande, for which cause I have sent here inclosed a short survey of sundrye the



abuses, of the spirituall Courtes, that by confrontinge them with the lawes of the lande, you might the better understande, the Lamentable servitude the Church is in to these harde lords." (Scott Pearson, p.481). This should be compared with the "Millenary Petition" of 1603 (Prothero "Documents", pp.413-416) the summary of the conclusions of the Hampton Court Conference (op.cit. pp.416, 417), and the "Articles of debate in a conference between the two Houses of Parliament, May 1604" (op.cit. pp.285, 286). There was in all these an approximation to the tone of the earliest controversy over vestments and 'particulars'. Nothing was said openly, however much might be implied in "reformation generally," about bishops, pastors, elders, or presbyterial assemblies. Not even a modified discipline retaining a titular bishop was suggested (e.g. as in 2nd Part Reg. Vol. II, Doc. No. 224, pp.199-202). This is not the place to discuss the problems of the silence on these matters, but the fact of the silence should be noticed.

9. Were it not for Hooker the development of Anglican and Puritan thought in the reign of Elizabeth would be fairly parallel; on the one side from Humphreys and Sampson to Cartwright and Travers and the men of the

Classes; on the other side Jewel, Whitgift, and Bancroft.

But there was no Puritan Hooker. This, it may be, was the reason why Presbyterianism never attained supremacy in England.

The problem of determining the numbers of the Puritans in England in the reign of Elizabeth is a task obscure and difficult. Estimates vary between that of the Venetian ambassador in 1607,<sup>2</sup> that they formed one third of the population of England, and that reached by Mr R.G. Usher, that they amounted to two per cent of the population<sup>3</sup>. The latter writer devotes a number of pages to the study of the problem<sup>4</sup>; from contemporary statistics he estimates that between 1562 and 1590 there were about 160 Puritan ministers<sup>5</sup>; by the decade 1600-1610 they had nearly doubled in number<sup>6</sup>. These men, he holds, were not highly distinguished in learning above the rest of the clergy<sup>7</sup>; the percentage of men who had taken university courses was about the same for the Puritan clergy as for the whole body of clergymen in the Church of England. He draws conclusions from the number of cases of presentment of Puritan clergy to the ecclesiastical courts by the churchwardens<sup>8</sup>, and from some other

---

(x) Usher, "Recons.", p.260.

(s) op.cit. p.269.

(+) op.cit. pp.250-291.

(e) op.cit. p.256.

(s) op.cit. p.259.

(e) op.cit. pp.252-254.

(+) op.cit. p.253.

PURITAN NUMBERS

The problem of determining the numbers of the Puritans in England in the reign of Elizabeth is a task obscure and difficult. Estimates vary between that of the Venetian ambassador in 1607,<sup>x</sup> (that they formed one third of the population of England, and that reached by Mr R.G. Usher, that they amounted to two per cent of the population<sup>§</sup>. The latter writer devotes a number of pages to the study of the problem<sup>+</sup>: from contemporary statistics he estimates that between 1582 and 1590 there were about 160 Puritan ministers: by the decade 1600-1610 they had nearly doubled in number<sup>φ</sup>. These men, he holds, were not highly distinguished in learning above the rest of the clergy: the percentage of men who had taken university courses was about the same for the Puritan clergy as for the whole body of clergymen in the Church of England. He draws conclusions from the number of cases of presentment of Puritan clergy to the ecclesiastical courts by the churchwardens<sup>‡</sup>, and from some other

- 
- (x) Usher, "Recons.", p.260.  
 (§) op.cit. p.269.  
 (+) op.cit. pp.250-281.  
 (e) op.cit. p.256.  
 (φ) op.cit. p.250.  
 (θ) op.cit. pp.252-254.  
 (‡) op.cit. p.263.

evidence<sup>x</sup>, that the movement was mainly clerical, and that its strength was really due to other causes. "The reasons for the growth of Puritanism are to be found neither in the unusual learning and ability of the Puritan ministers nor in the ardent support accorded them by a large section of the English people. They are disclosed in the complicated and perplexing economic and institutional condition of the Church."<sup>§</sup> It was the falling of benefices and advowsons into the hands of Puritan gentry or town councils, and the support of sympathizers who moved in influential government circles, that was their main strength<sup>†</sup>. It is noticeable that the Midlands and Eastern Counties were the centres of the movement.<sup>©</sup> Mr Usher sums up his conclusions thus: "The Puritans, then, were not a great 'party' with the best third of the English clergy and nearly a third of the laity enlisted in its support, and asking only for the change of some few ceremonies. So far as there was any party, it was mainly composed in 1603 of about 350 men, supported by the gentry and town corporations of their districts in the face of more or less apathetic congregations, having the adherence of perhaps 50,000 able-bodied men,

---

(x) op.cit. pp.264-268.

(§) op.cit. p.269.

(+) cf. Chapter on "Puritan Supporters", pp.26-28.

(e) Usher, "Recons.", p.270.



pretty well distributed over the eastern counties, the Midlands, and the South."<sup>x</sup>

It can hardly be claimed however that this is the last word on the subject. There is a good deal of contemporary evidence which Mr Usher seems to neglect almost entirely. Hooker, for example, seems to have fears that the Church of England may quite possibly be overthrown. "Though for no other cause, yet for this; that posterity may know we have not loosely through silence permitted things to pass away as in a dream"<sup>§</sup>, are the opening words of the Preface to his work. He speaks of "such numbers of otherwise right well affected and most religiously inclined minds"<sup>+</sup> and "what doth move the common sort so much to favour this innovation"<sup>⊖</sup>, and he was not a man who would rashly generalize, nor who lacked means of access to reliable sources of information. His experiences at the Temple showed that there were a number of lawyers who favoured Puritan ritual.

The records of the transactions of Elizabeth's Parliaments suggest that Puritanism was fairly strong in the country. Even when allowances have been made for the

- 
- (x) op.cit. p.280.
  - (§) Hooker E.P. Pref. i.1.
  - (+) Hooker E.P. Pref. i.2.
  - (⊖) op.cit. Pref. iii.5.

facts that Catholics realized that their policy was to keep in the background, that the Oath of Supremacy would keep Catholics out of the House of Commons, that the energetic parties always would secure a representation and a hearing, there still remains something not explained. Elizabeth could not, until the last decade of her reign, place any reliance on her Parliaments in the anti-Puritan campaign: indeed it required all her tact and authority to restrain the Puritan element in the House of Commons from taking action. One can hardly imagine that the persistence of the "further-reformation" party was based on no popular support worth mentioning. The Puritans themselves spoke of "the leaning, or rather affection of the greatest part of Gospellers both high and lowe towards Discipline"<sup>x</sup>. They based their appeal partly on the needs and desires of "manye a thousand in this land"<sup>§</sup>. Cartwright could also adduce "the zeale for religion / whych sheweth it selfe / in many / as well of the nobility / and gentry of this realme / as of the people / their care to continue it / and aduance it / their voluntary charges to maintaine it / their liberality towards them / which bend themselves that way."<sup>+</sup> It is

---

(x) "Eccles. Disc." Introd. p.iii (Cartwright).

(§) "Second Adm." p.59.

(+) T.C. I, p.5.

true that popular estimates are notoriously unreliable: Sir Walter Raleigh could in 1593 speak of "near twenty thousand 'Brownists' in England"<sup>x</sup> - an absurd estimate, unless he was including Puritans as well. But statistics at the time were unreliable, and it must be remembered that there would be many Puritan supporters who would not be included in them, since straying from the path of strict conformity might lead to serious consequences. There must have been a number of men who were not hostile to moderate reform, but would not join the more extreme who had become prominent and secured the leading positions, stamping the Puritan movement with its characteristic features.

Still, it must be admitted that the trend of the evidence is generally towards diminishing the usual estimates of Puritan strength under Elizabeth.

[Cf. an interesting argument by C.H. Firth, in his preface to the "2nd Part Reg." p.xvi.]

---

(x) D'Ewes 'Journals', p.517. Quoted in Burrage "Dissenters", Vol. I, p.152.

(+) Scott Pearson, p.445. of op.cit. p.862.

it that extreme measures were impolitic. Burghley was too near the NOTES ON PURITAN SUPPORTERS might prejudice his position. He took steps in 1585 on behalf of

There is much evidence that Puritanism, or at least individual Puritans, found a wide range of support in England. The numbers of influential leaders in the state who protected or interceded for them or some of their number is considerable: the position of their supporters in Elizabeth's counsels is more noteworthy still.

Burghley was constantly the recipient of Puritan appeals. Instances of his actual intervention are to be found. His appeal to Whitgift for moderation is a classic<sup>x</sup>. He employed Travers as his domestic chaplain and tutor to his son Robert, and helped to secure for him his post at the Temple<sup>§</sup>. He acted on Cartwright's behalf in 1585 - "testimonium .... in clarissimo regni senatus concessu de me"<sup>+</sup> - and again in May 1592. On the latter occasion however Cartwright and his fellow sufferers had endured some eighteen months imprisonment, during which Burghley had received numerous petitions, so he cannot be described as an enthusiastic supporter of the Puritans. Rather was

---

(x) cf. Prothero "Documents", pp.213, 214.

(§) cf. Miss Fell Smith in D.N.B. Article "Walter Travers".

(+) Scott Pearson, p.443, cf. op.cit. p.357.



it that extreme measures were impolitic. Burghley was too near the Queen to do anything rash that might prejudice his position. He took steps in 1586 on behalf of Cawdry, who was in trouble with Aylmer<sup>x</sup>, and his connection with Robert Browne the Separatist is famous.

Leicester is well known as a supporter of Puritans. He gave Cartwright the position of Master of the Hospital at Warwick in 1586<sup>§</sup>, and sought to have him licensed to preach<sup>+</sup>. He arranged a conference between two bishops (Canterbury and Winchester) and two Puritan ministers (Sparke and Travers) concerning points at dispute in the Book of Common Prayer<sup>⓪</sup>. He interested himself in the restoration of suspended preachers to their functions<sup>⓪</sup>.

Walsingham was the agent in securing for Cartwright the task of confuting the Catholic seminarist productions, and arranged liberal financial conditions<sup>⓪</sup>. He also gave advice to the Puritanically inclined Merchant Adventurers' church in Antwerp<sup>+</sup>.

- 
- (x) cf. "2nd Part Reg.", Vol. II, p.206.
  - (§) cf. Scott Pearson, p.294.
  - (+) cf. op.cit. p.231.
  - (e) cf. "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, Doc. No. 173, pp.275-283.
  - (⓪) cf. op.cit. Vol. I, p.135.
  - (⓪) cf. Scott Pearson, pp.198, 199.
  - (+) cf. op.cit. pp.175, 180-182.

Davison had been active in establishing this Puritan church<sup>x</sup>, and gave very practical assistance to Cartwright, who could return only "paper for gold"<sup>s</sup>. In connection with this church in Antwerp Lord Cobham and Killigrew appear as Puritan sympathisers. An active agent in the affair was the Puritan Tomson<sup>+</sup>.

Adam Loftus, Archbishop first of Armagh and then of Dublin, should be mentioned.<sup>e</sup> Cartwright was his domestic chaplain about 1565-6<sup>e</sup>. He wrote to Cecil on Cartwright's behalf in 1570<sup>o</sup>. Puritanism was strong in Ireland: it was a natural reaction to the naked, powerful, and often degraded Roman Catholicism of that country.

Mildmay was described by Wigginton as his "good frend"<sup>o</sup>.

The Earl of Bedford "prevailed in his suites for the church, namely, for Mr T.C. [Cartwright], one principall pillar of the same."<sup>o</sup>

The Earls of Warwick and Huntingdon were also Wigginton's "well willers and frends". Warwick was a well-known Puritan supporter<sup>o</sup>.

"The Countess of Warwick, Sir Drue Drury and others" befriended Udall. Drue Drury was another general supporter<sup>o</sup>.

- 
- (x) cf. op.cit. pp.171, 175.
  - (s) op.cit. pp.436-438, 189.
  - (+) cf. op.cit. p.180.
  - (e) cf. Scott Pearson, p.20.
  - (o) cf. op.cit. p.37.
  - (o) "2nd Part Reg." Vol. II, p.238.
  - (o) op.cit. Vol. II, p.240.
  - (oo) op.cit. Vol. II, p.245. Usher "Recons.", p.270.
  - (o) "2nd Part Reg." Vol. II, p.40. Usher, "Recons.", p.270.

The Lady Anne Bacon was well known as a friend to Puritans.<sup>⌘</sup>

Lord Grey of Wilton, Sir Richard Knightley, Sir Edward Montague, Sir Francis Hastings, Sir Robert Wroth, and Sir Robert Jermyn were also known<sup>§</sup>.

The Privy Council not unnaturally favoured the Puritans upon occasion, considering that it included in its ranks many of the above, and other Puritan supporters such as Knollys. Its attitude, like Burghley's, would be dictated by the exigencies of political policy. In the years immediately preceding 1588 "the Council as a rule looked with a kindly eye upon the Puritan ministers"<sup>+</sup>; they would not break the united front against Rome. They supported a Mr. Huckle against the Bishop of London in a letter "signed on May 4th, 1584, by Burghley, Knolls, Warwick, Walsingham, Charles Howard, Henry Sidney"<sup>e</sup>. In the same year one Mr. Benison was likewise helped: his letter was signed by the above minus Sidney, plus Bromley, Bedford, Leicester, Croft, Mildmay, and Hatton<sup>φ</sup>. Certain Essex ministers suspended in 1587/8 desired "a conference

---

(⌘) loc.cit. and "2nd Part Reg.", Vol. I, pp.13, 14.

(§) Usher, "Recons.", p.270.

(+) Scott Pearson, p.235. cf. op.cit. p.236.

(e) "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.245.

(φ) op.cit. Vol. I, p.247.

before the Council or some other impartial body."<sup>x</sup> Such references show the esteem in which Elizabeth's chosen assistants were held even by the Puritans.

Many of the English Merchants were Puritans. They had come into contact with reformed principles in the course of their trade with the continent of Europe, and had very good reason to hate Spain and all represented by Spain.<sup>s</sup>

Cambridge University was a stronghold of Puritanism<sup>+</sup>. 33 members petitioned the government in Cartwright's favour in 1570, and some of the students shared in the "supplication" activity of 1586<sup>e</sup>.

Puritan petitions and supplications from others than ministers included:-

To the Queen from 175 men of Norwich in 1583.

2nd Part Reg. Vol.I, No.112, pp.157-160.

To the Lords of the Council from 5 gentlemen of Norfolk 1583 or 84.

Vol.I, No.142, p.225.

To the Archbishop of Canterbury from 7 "gentlemen of Cambridgeshire".

Vol.I, No.147, p.228.

other hand 23 members of the flock of Mr Werns at Leich

- 
- (x) op.cit. Vol. II, p.259.  
 (§) cf. Scott Pearson, p.169.  
 (+) cf. op.cit. pp.32, 33 and 36.  
 (e) cf. "2nd Part Reg.", Vol. II, Doc. No.211, pp.185-187.  
 (+) op.cit. Vol. I, p.119.  
 (§) op.cit. Vol. I, p.156.



to "To the Parliament" from "the people of Cornewall",  
1586.

The Presbyterian minister Vol. II, No.206, pp.174-177.

in "To the Queen from the "loyall and sincere-hearted. They  
subjects of the Citie of London". 1586.

sent a letter in 1586, app Vol. II, No.207, pp.177, 178.

to "To the Parliament" from "the citie of London". 1586.

Vol. II, No.210, p.185.

Pastours of England? Later the Presbyterians on either

"To the Counsell" from Malden and district [Essex]. 1586.

side of the border maintain Vol. II, No.212, pp.187, 188.

of "To the high Courte of Parliament" from the same.

"A<sup>o</sup> 1586".

venient to leave their home Vol. II, No.213, pp.188, 189.

an "To the Counsel" from 98 "inhabitants within the  
hundred of Rocheford in Essex." 1586.

Andrews to Cartwright in 1586 Vol. II, No.214, pp.189, 190.

To "To the parliament" from "certaine hundreds in Essex."  
1586.

duced King James to write Vol. II, No.215, p.190.

of To Parliament through Lord Rich from 236 men of Dunmow  
in Essex. 1586.

ings alienated Scott Presby Vol. II, No.217, pp.191, 192.

England and made them more eager than before to assist

Surety of £100 was offered for Field in 1572<sup>x</sup>.

Paritarianism; the move that was to mark the relations of the

two Some ministers continued to receive maintenance from

their congregations after suspension; e.g. Strowd at

Cranebrook† and Field in St Aldermay Parish§. On the

other hand 28 members of the flock of Mr Negus at Leigh

in Essex desired him to conform sufficiently to be allowed

(x) op.cit. Vol. I, p. 90. 275.

(+) op.cit. Vol. I, p.119.

(§) op.cit. Vol. I, p.136.

to continue his ministrations to them<sup>\*</sup>.

The Presbyterian ministers in Scotland took a keen interest in what was happening in the sister kingdom. They sent a letter in 1566, appealing for moderation towards tender consciences, to "their brethren the Bishops and Pastours of Englande"<sup>§</sup>. Later the Presbyterians on either side of the border maintained friendly relations with each other, and offered hospitality to those who found it convenient to leave their homes for a season. Udall, Penry and Waldegrave benefited thus<sup>+</sup>. The overtures of St Andrews to Cartwright in 1580 have been mentioned<sup>Ⓢ</sup>: Travers also was approached. The Scots ministers even induced King James to write to Elizabeth in 1591 on behalf of the Puritan prisoners<sup>Ⓟ</sup>. Bancroft's Sermons and writings alienated Scots Presbyterians from the Church of England and made them more eager than before to assist Puritanism<sup>Ⓣ</sup>: the note that was to mark the relations of the two countries in the next century had been struck.

So it may be understood that from Hooker's point of view there was a very real need for such a task as he undertook.

---

(\*) op.cit. Vol. I, pp.274, 275.

(§) "A parte etc." p.125.

(+) cf. Scott Pearson, p.339.

(Ⓢ) cf. p. 14.

(Ⓟ) cf. Scott Pearson, pp.463, 464.

(Ⓣ) cf. op.cit. pp.340-342.

and overflows in enthusiasm; they were sober and restrain-

## ed. THE LITERARY ASPECT OF THE PURITAN CONTROVERSY

much concerned with the subject matter of their tracts

to heed the considerations of style and charm in the

The age of Elizabeth is a period of unparalleled splendour in the history of English Literature. From a very bare ground there grew in little more than a generation the tree which bore the magnificent fruit of the greatest English dramatists, in addition to a wealth of other literature of much excellence. In another realm of Art, namely Music, the discovery is now being made that the people of Elizabeth's time were marvellously skilled. In the towns, and among the gentry of the country, the singing of complex part songs at sight from the simplest of scores was a part of the equipment of every educated man. Everyone who reckoned himself a gentleman also learned how to write with elegance and grace. The new national life, the result of the Renaissance and the Reformation in England, with its realisation of freedom and energy, found part of its expression in the fine arts. The literature of the Puritan controversy does not convey much of the breath of this new life to its readers. Only a few glimpses are vouchsafed of the life of the Puritans as it was lived from day to day. The Puritans themselves were not of the temperament which effervesces

and overflows in enthusiasm; they were sober and restrained, except in the heat of controversy. They were too much concerned with the subject matter of their tracts to heed the considerations of style and charm in the setting forth of what they had to say. In this they were probably guilty of an unwitting error. An argument that makes an aesthetic appeal, that is presented so as to charm the taste, secures a readier hearing than any bare statement, however true it be. This must have been the case particularly in Elizabethan England, for the reasons set forth above. It is to be remembered that the Puritans were not primarily making a popular appeal, but were seeking to secure the ear of the governing classes. But the Puritans consistently overlooked the part that pleasure in the things of this life plays in the formation of human opinion. They were not without capacities for enjoyment - the author of "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" was a Puritan - but it was not in most of them to make much of their joys, nor to study to please others. So the literary quality of most Puritan productions is not high. The earnestness of tone is unmistakable, but the tendency is to secure force at the risk of mere abusiveness, and the appeal to the intellect is made by dry syllogistic anarchy, disloyalty, and the like. Upon all he found.



arguments, whose logic is not always unquestionable. The great controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift was stultified, from a literary point of view, by the practice adopted by both in dealing with the rival publications of answering analytically paragraph by paragraph. Literary grace can never shine through a commentary. Striking sentences and passages abounded, but much of the treatment is almost intolerably boring to the average reader. Nothing could be less well calculated to arouse interest and overcome indifference.

The Marprelate Tracts did not strike a really new note. They were written throughout in the abusive key, of which many examples could be found in earlier Puritan tracts, but their popularity was secured by an abundance of satire and wit. Argument was for the most part conspicuous by its absence, except for argumenta ad homines. In their popular appeal these tracts were not characteristically Puritan. The lampoons penned in retaliation are not worthy of serious mention. The real answer came from Bancroft. His two volumes on the Puritans were likewise rather destitute of solid argument. His method was to go through the documents of the Puritan movement collecting all the evidence he could find of tendencies towards anarchy, disloyalty, and the like. Upon all he found,

and an imposing sum total it was, he set as damaging a construction as possible. His works are in many chapters a mere patchwork of quotations.

"Bancroft's books were followed by those of a man who was not at the mercy of a prejudiced leit-motif, a man who could see the Puritan wood in spite of its serried ranks of trees."<sup>x</sup> The whole controversy prior to Hooker's advent is barren of real literary merit, but the charge cannot be substantiated of Hooker himself. He had a strong and ponderous line of argument to develop, and was more concerned with his own positive doctrine than with the piecemeal destruction of Puritan arguments. He set forth his reasoning with meticulous care, choosing words and weighing them painstakingly, building his theme phrase by phrase and sentence by sentence. He was not of the type to write for the general public, but his work was bound to be widely influential among the men who were of real importance in the nation, in an age which enjoyed and appreciated skilful workmanship for its own sake. It must be remembered, too, that the "Ecclesiastical Polity" is the first great prose work of what may be called modern English. The amount of time and energy devoted by Hooker

---

(x) Scott Pearson, p.371.

to his labours was considerable when compared with the practice of other controversialists. These usually replied to opponents within the year: Hooker published nothing till seven years had passed from the time when his task was set him by his difficulties with Travers. It was well worth while. The Bancroft School<sup>x</sup> could not have established so strongly the Church of England which Hooker loved without the wide basis laid by his efforts, in thought and in philosophy. Puritanism might have been more successful had it been less surrounded with controversial dust, but a Puritan Hooker would have been an impossibility in Elizabeth's England: political changes had to take place before the Puritan arguments and theology could receive complete free expression. Hooker remains supreme, rising above the controversial level in quest of the heights of absolute truth, shaping his message with an art and care that have made it a heritage for the ages.

---

(x) "The Bancroftian school, now [1590-91] rising into prominence, was determined to prove with meticulous accuracy that the Church of England was an institution whose Catholic foundations were firmly based on the warrants of antiquity, and whose continuity with the early Church was not broken by any residuum or out-crop of Presbyterianism in the days of Augustine." (Scott Pearson, p.325).

(x) cf. *...*

behind their statements. Complete and sweeping generalisations were frequently subject to qualification when examined or amplified. The matters dis-

### PRIMARY ASSUMPTIONS

Hooker and his opponents both adopted the same general methods of argument, methods which they inherited from the Middle Ages. They stated principles as a beginning<sup>x</sup>. From these principles, or by means of them, conclusions were reached. The a priori argument was the recognised form of the time: Bacon's "Novum Organum" was not yet. It was the fact that each side used this method that made the Puritan controversy so fruitless for the most part. The majority of the disputants were more eager to press their own conclusions than to examine carefully and state logically the steps that had led them to these conclusions. The fundamental presuppositions had been obscured in the dust of disputation. In their zeal for conversions men had tended to overlook their own assumptions. Writers and debaters often had not fully recognised the implications involved in their arguments. The contestants were generally more eager to score points or to reach some desired conclusion than to probe the roots of their belief or to work out to the full what lay

---

(x) cf. Hooker, E.P., V, v.l. force of religion and



behind their statements. Complete and sweeping generalizations were frequent, but were usually subject to qualification when examined or amplified. The matters discussed were not remote from the circumstances of daily life and work, and practical considerations had a paralyzing influence upon purely abstract speculation. The fundamental opposition of the basal axioms of the rival parties was thus unrecognized, and much labour expended on proofs which could prove nothing if the foundations of the argument were not accepted by both sides. Hooker was superior to all who preceded him in the controversy in that he sought to make explicit all the bases of his thought, but even he could not altogether escape from his environment and take a wholly dispassionate view of matters. Had he accomplished this he would indeed have been superhuman.

There was indeed one point upon which all were agreed. It came from the belief inherited from the Medieval period that there must be uniformity in religion throughout Christendom. The rise of separate states, combined with the reformation movements, was reducing this to a doctrine of national uniformity, at least for all practical purposes, though the wider uniformity was still desired and desirable. The divorce of religion and

politics is comparatively modern, and has never been complete, for there is an essential unity in human life. In the reign of Elizabeth hardly anyone thought it possible to separate secular matters entirely from religious; all were agreed that the maintenance of religion was a proper and important function of the state. "We agree that pure and unstained religion ought to be the highest of all and cares appertaining to public regiment"<sup>x</sup>. This belief was founded upon the theory, to which most men rendered at least lip service, that "the very worldly peace and prosperity, the secular happiness, the temporal and natural good estate both of all men and of all dominions hangeth chiefly upon religion"<sup>s</sup>. The Queen could speak to Parliament of "one matter " that "toucheth me so near, as I may not overskip, religion, the ground on which all other matters ought to take root, and being corrupted may mar all the tree!"<sup>+</sup> 'Pure and true religion' was almost certain to be defined as the brand acceptable to the government: "cujus regio, ejus religio" was the natural principle within states at the time. Toleration was foreign to the spirit of the age, and could hardly have

---

(x) Hooker, E.P., V. i.2.

(s) op.cit. V, lxxvi.1.

(+) Prothero "Documents", p.221.

(s) op. cit. E.P. Pref. vi.

been granted with safety, even if Elizabeth had been so inclined. The severance of religious beliefs from political activities was to be accomplished only through much tribulation. The Puritans themselves would probably have been much less tolerant than the Church of England if they had come to power<sup>(\*)</sup>. No Catholic could hold more firmly the doctrine of "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus", and Geneva under Calvin had had experience of what that doctrine could mean. Hooker, in spite of his breadth of mind, also required conformity within the nation to the defined standard, for the sake of order if no better reason existed<sup>(§)</sup>. Thus, throughout the Puritan controversy, religion and politics were inextricably interwoven.

than all her critics, who she had insisted on leaving matters of opinion out of dispute as far as possible and had required only an outward show of conformity to a standard distinctly conservative, yet remarkably elastic for that age. Her policy enabled a wide variety of doctrine to be included in the national church in its early years, and, though such trouble arose later, her establishment of religion had in spite of all its defects secured a position in the national life which enabled it to sur-

(\*) cf. T.C. II, pp. cxvii and cxviii.

(§) cf. E.P. Pref. vi.

from a civil war inspired merely by religious animosity.

THE PROBLEM: CHURCH AND STATE

---

The grounds of that division in the Church of England which gave rise to the Puritan problem were at first ill-defined and confused. Only gradually had the rival lines of battle been arrayed. In the first encounters of the reign of Elizabeth there was much uncertainty: men had no clear vision in their own minds of that for which they stood. The key to the earlier disputes appeared as definitions were gradually framed and the forces impelling men took shape from the bewildering complexity, almost chaos, of the beginning of the reign. The Queen had been wiser than some of her advisers, wiser than all her critics, when she had insisted on leaving matters of opinion out of dispute as far as possible and had required only an outward show of conformity to a standard distinctly conservative, yet remarkably elastic for that age. Her policy enabled a wide variety of doctrine to be included in the national church in its early years, and, though much trouble arose later, her establishment of religion had in spite of all its defects secured a position in the national life which enabled it to survive: it had attained strength sufficient to save England from a civil war inspired merely by religious animosity:



it had begun to develop a national basis in thought, distinct from the bases adopted by the continental reformers. The religious difficulties of the reign were due to a clearer working out of what was only implied at first. The vestments controversy was important because of the deeper questions of which it was but a symptom. In 1572 it became clear that there was a far greater division of opinion between the Establishment and its Puritan critics than on externals of rites and clothing. "Neither is the controversie betwixt them and us as they would beare the world in hand, as for a cap, a tippet, or a surplesse, but for great matters concerning a true ministry and regiment of the church, according to the word,"<sup>x</sup> wrote Field and Wilcox in the "Admonition to the Parliament"<sup>(1)</sup>.

The subject matter of the controversy was then what Hooker termed "Ecclesiastical Polity"<sup>(2)</sup>. The controversy itself could not, however, be confined to ecclesiastics. In England, as throughout Europe at that time, politics were altogether entangled with religious affairs. The main framework of the Church of England had been erected by the civil authority, Parliament, working in conjunction with the crown and not the church. The Act of Supremacy<sup>§</sup>

---

(x) "Ad. Parlt." fol. B viii verso.

(§) 1 Eliz. Cap. I. Prothero "Documents". pp.1-13.

(p) 1 Eliz. Cap. I. op.cit. pp.13-24.  
(e) cf. op.cit. pp.245, 246.

restored "to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual"<sup>x</sup>. All administrative authority was centred in the crown. All officers of the state, ecclesiastical and civil, except members of the Houses of Parliament, had to take an oath declaring that the Queen was "the only supreme governor of this realm ... as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal."<sup>§</sup> The determination of heresy was a matter for Parliamentary decision, apart from heresies already determined to be such "by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils ...." The oath was further demanded by 5 Eliz. Cap. I<sup>+</sup> of members of the House of Commons, teachers, lawyers, all in ecclesiastical orders, and all with University degrees. The Act of Uniformity<sup>φ</sup> gave the Queen authority over the ceremonies and rites of the Church. The practice of congé d'élire did not conceal the fact that the bishops were nominees of the crown<sup>e</sup>. The church was indeed in many ways merely a department of state: the Queen was head of both, and did not distinguish the headships. Any attempt to make changes in ecclesiastical matters was

---

(x) Title of Act: op.cit. p.1. § 8 op.cit. pp.5, 6.  
 (§) § 9 op.cit. pp.6,7. § 20 op.cit. p.12.  
 (+) op.cit. pp.39-41. § 13 op.cit. p.41. § 4 op.cit.p.40.  
 (φ) 1 Eliz. Cap. II, op.cit. pp.13-20.  
 (e) cf. op.cit. pp.242, 243.

therefore bound to assume a political aspect, for the Queen, as "supreme governor" of the church was immediately concerned. That was the essence of the Puritan problem.

The Puritans had strong ideas on Ecclesiastical Polity. They took their definition of "the Church" from Calvin. "The outward markes wherby a true christian church is knowne, are preaching of the woorde purely, ministring of the sacraments sincerely, and Ecclesiasticall discipline, which consisteth in admonition and correction of faults severely."<sup>x</sup> This formula, apparently vague and indefinite, was expanded by them to cover a Presbyterian system of organization, by the use of two principles. The first, which was the leading Puritan demand, was that everything in the Church was to be done or framed "according to the Word of God". There is hardly a page in any Puritan pamphlet which does not bear this mark. It was supplemented by a second principle, that anything which savoured particularly of Catholicism was to be rejected as impure: this would have abolished Episcopacy, Vestments, the Prayer Book and the Canon Law at one stroke<sup>(3)</sup>. In place of these the Puritans proposed to substitute a hierarchy of consistories, or courts composed of ministers and elected laymen - 'seniors' or 'elders' - for

---

(x) "Ad. Parlt." fol. A ii verso.

administrative and judicial functions, the Geneva gown, the Genevan order of service, which gave the minister considerable freedom, and the Bible.

The Queen naturally did not approve of a scheme which would deprive her of much of her power, nor were the bishops eager to resign their positions. Puritan propagandists met with resistance, not support. The difficulties besetting the party which desired further reformation caused them to bring forward a variety of arguments in favour of their proposals. The plea that Protestant doctrines had to be buttressed by Presbyterian organization in order to survive<sup>(4)</sup> was not impressive, except for those who looked to Geneva, and did not touch the root of the difficulty, which was the tenure by the Queen of England of the Supreme Governorship of the Church of England, and her refusal to introduce the Puritan system.

In the endeavour to avoid an attack on the Queen as the supreme ecclesiastical authority many Puritans accused the bishops of being the cause of all their woes<sup>(5)</sup>, and of all that was amiss in the Church of England<sup>(6)</sup>. It was the misfortune of the bishops to be the spear-head of the anti-Puritan campaigns, and the bulwark against Puritan schemes when the government was too much occupied with other matters to devote energy to the ecclesiastical



régime. The Puritans seem to have formed a simple and naïve estimate of the character of Elizabeth: they thought that she could be hoodwinked by selfish ecclesiastics, and that she had allowed her bishops to usurp some of her authority. Abuse of the bishops was a feature of many Puritan pamphlets<sup>π</sup>: some blamed them for deceiving the Queen, others for not instructing the Queen properly. It was assumed that the Queen desired to do rightly in religious matters, and was moved by "a zeale to God"<sup>§</sup>, but that she was either misled by her advisers<sup>(7)</sup>, or, erring in ignorance, was being confirmed in error by selfish time-servers<sup>(8)</sup>. When reference was made to the Queen herself it was generally in highly complimentary terms: most Puritans were sufficiently acquainted with the character of their ruler to refrain from attacking her<sup>(9)</sup>. They knew that the bishops and leading ecclesiastics had small reason to speak well of them: they could therefore with some plausibility assume that hostility was altogether inspired from that quarter. The attitude of the House of Commons would encourage them in their opinion: with regard to Puritanism there were obvious differences between the crown and the lower House of

---

(π) cf. "Ad.Parlt." Preface. fol. i recto et verso.  
 (§) "A parte etc." p.5.

Parliament, and who were more likely to influence the government in religious matters than the ecclesiastical leaders?

A more ingenious line of assault on episcopacy was the suggestion that episcopal authority was usurped, that bishops as bishops had no discretionary authority in the Church of England, but could act only within the limits assigned by statute, law and royal commissions<sup>x</sup>. Cartwright declared that episcopal rule was a remnant of papacy, even as were the surplice and the ceremonies to which the Puritans objected<sup>(10)</sup>. Other Puritans saw in episcopacy a continuation of the imperium in imperio which Catholicism sought<sup>§</sup>. The same arguments were brought forward constantly whenever the ecclesiastical authorities were active. When Whitgift as archbishop proceeded to put pressure on the Puritans, suggestions were made that his "jurisdiction" was "grounded upon the popes authority, and justeling against her highnes roiall crowne and scepter"<sup>+</sup> and his "authoritie directly against her lawfull authoritie"<sup>o</sup>. One wonders whether the Puritans dreamed of the archbishop undergoing a trial for treason, or of

---

(x) cf. "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.203.

(§) cf. "2nd Part Reg." Vol. II, pp.240, 87.

(+) cf. op.cit. Vol. I, p.196.

(o) cf. op.cit. Vol. I, p.199.

exposing him to a "praemunire". Some so far misread history as to imagine, or at any rate declare, that the former papal authority in England had descended to the Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>(11)</sup>. It was insinuated that the state might be in danger from the prelates: "Reade the stories of such Bish. and Arch. as haue preuailed against their princes, and driue them out of their owne realmes."<sup>x</sup>

There were incidents which seemed to give support to Puritan contentions. Aylmer, Bishop of London, had arrested Cartwright upon the latter's return to England in 1585, and found himself in trouble in consequence. His complaint to Burghley throws vivid light upon the Queen's character and policy<sup>(12)</sup>. At the time the authorities were busy against Rome, and favourably disposed towards the Puritan ministers: the last named were active, and the Bishops, who thus had their hands full, frequently complained. "For their literal devotion to duty they received neither thanks nor support."<sup>§</sup>

But there was sufficient evidence to make it clear to close observers that the Puritans misinterpreted the situation. The crown might at times leave the bishops

---

(x) "A parte etc." p.293 margin.

(§) Scott Pearson, p.235.

to plough a lonely furrow, but on the whole Elizabeth showed plainly that she was resolutely opposed to Puritanism. The bishops could not be held responsible for the views of their Queen: Elizabeth had independently of ecclesiastical opinion decided on the religious policy of her reign. Parliament was guided away from proposals of a Puritan tinge with that mixture of firmness and tact which made Elizabeth a great ruler. She lectured the bishops<sup>(13)</sup>, but allied herself with them in opposition to further reforms. Any who ventured to oppose her soon learnt that they were her servants: Grindal's fate by itself should have been a sufficient lesson as to the policy of the crown. The Act of 1593<sup>K</sup> "to retain the Queen's subjects in obedience" was a death knell to all Puritan hopes of influence in high places.

The attempt to find a divergence between Crown and Church was a failure. Any divergence there was on religious matters was rather between the Crown and the Houses of Parliament. The Puritans could not be unaware that their lack of success was due to the sturdy opposition of the Queen to their proposals. They therefore attacked the problem on the theoretical side, and sought to prove

---

(K) 35 Eliz. Cap. I.



that the civil and ecclesiastical organizations ought to be separate. It was not disestablishment that they sought, but rather establishment on a basis separate from that of the state. The church was still to be the commonwealth viewed from the religious and ecclesiastical standpoint, but it and the commonwealth were to be merely co-partners, guiding in conjunction, not in union, the activities of the nation. The Puritans sought to make the Church a more or less autonomous body, managing its own affairs<sup>(14)</sup>. Ecclesiastics were to deal only with spiritual matters: magistrates only with secular<sup>¶</sup>. Bishops in England could inflict other than spiritual penalties, as Puritans knew well: ecclesiastics ought not to have such rights. It was the use made by the episcopal courts of fines and imprisonment as punishments that bore with most severity on Puritans, therefore their strongest attacks were delivered against this practice<sup>(15)</sup>. They found a text in the "Apologia" of Bishop Jewel, who had attacked the Catholic clergy for their use of the "secular sword". "Veteres canones apostolorum illum episcopum, qui simul et civilem magistratum et ecclesiasticam functionem obire velit, jubent ob officio summo veri"<sup>§</sup>.

---

(¶) cf. T.C. I, p.2.

(§) Jewel "Apol." p.31. Pars V. Cap. iii, Div. 7.

This theme was developed by Travers, who suggested that there was danger of the Church of England attaining the same lofty position within the kingdom as had been gained by powerful popes in earlier empires<sup>(16)</sup>. The ecclesiastical courts were, according to him, dealing with matters which should come before the civil magistrates<sup>(17)</sup>. Other Puritans supported this plea, and declared that church tribunals should take cognisance only of ecclesiastical cases, and inflict only ecclesiastical penalties, such as excommunication<sup>(18)</sup>. For this they would need no permission from the secular power<sup>(19)</sup>.

What seems the logical corollary to this line of argument was not pressed by the Puritans. The civil courts had not, according to Puritan ideas, overstepped their limits. The Queen left it to the bishops to decree rites and ceremonies. Parliamentary attempts to direct ecclesiastical affairs had been made in the Puritan interest. There was no existing cause to make Puritans desirous that magistrates should have nothing to do with the Church: on the contrary the civil authority had a very definite place in the Puritan system<sup>(20)</sup>. The Puritans knew how little the penalties of excommunication weighed upon many men, and they did not wish to deprive themselves of the powers of imprisonment and fine. The

care of religion was, in these days, one of the chief duties of the State, according to the generally accepted opinion<sup>(20)</sup>. For the proper administration of the church the "magistrate" was essential, though he had in it no legislative powers<sup>(21)</sup>. He was to see that all was rightly done<sup>(22)</sup>, to interfere when matters were amiss<sup>(23)</sup>, to coerce obstinate offenders against discipline<sup>(24)</sup>, and to see that those who were irreligious attended church services. He was to provide for a supply of suitable candidates for the ministry, and attend to the payment of ministers<sup>(25)</sup>. The Puritans, in fact, wished the church to have some control over the secular sword. In purely religious matters, indeed, the secular ruler was to be subject to the minister<sup>(26)</sup>.

Such doctrine sounded very dangerous in the sixteenth century. No ruler could feel safe upon the throne if the crown was to have no immediate authority over a large part of the national life. It must be remembered that religious questions were the burning questions of the day, and Elizabeth might well feel that she could not afford to allow any of her subjects to delimit a sphere for themselves wherein she was not to interfere except upon terms fixed by them. Religion had been a powerful influence in

---

(x) cf. p. 60 above.

bringing about the fall of Mary of Scotland: religion was daily fomenting troubles in France, the Netherlands, and the Hapsburg Empire. In England the Queen had secured a firm hold upon religious matters, and she could not afford to let them go. As it was her inclinations supported the politic course. Her powers had been recognized by Parliament and had been exercised with general approval. She held to them unyieldingly, as certain members of Parliament found out<sup>x</sup>.

The Puritans were not insensitive to the criticisms that were passed upon their scheme. They protested constantly that their discipline was a guarantee of the preservation of good order and government<sup>(27)</sup>. They declared that reformation on the lines desired by them would not injure the state one whit<sup>(28)</sup>. However their definition of "the State" was not that adopted by the Queen and her advisers. For the latter the State really included the Church of England. It was the Queen who wielded the two swords: and Puritanism, however it tried to present its claim that the Church should wield the spiritual sword, could not prosecute its campaign without attacking the Queen. The circumstances of the time made the feat impossible. Puritanism, if put into practice, was illegal

---

(x) e.g. Strickland in 1571: Cope and others in 1587.



in England, as Judge Clarke told Udall<sup>(29)</sup>.

The Puritans gave this fact tacit recognition in their agitation for the alteration of the law. They presented petitions to Parliament, to the Privy Council, to the Crown itself, appealing for the establishing of their "Discipline"<sup>(30)</sup>. It seems rather strange that men who declared that the Church ought to be a law unto itself should act thus. What Parliament could bestow, or the crown order, Parliament could presumably annul, or the crown cancel. The Separatists were more consistent: if they sought anything of the State it was the recognition of a freedom already assumed.

The Puritans had adopted an ideal which was incompatible with the existing constitution of the English state. They wished to realize their ideal without revolution. The Queen refused to listen to Puritan propositions, and the Puritans were checkmated. Their problem was too complex, and their range of thought too limited, for them to set forth the underlying principles whose hostility to one another was the cause of the Puritan failure, but the controversy raised profound questions concerning political obligation, loyalty, the rights of conscience, and the relation of religion to politics. It was an Anglican clergyman, Richard Hooker, who analysed

the situation and probed into its intricacies. His great work is an attempt to go to the foundations of the Puritan problem, and by so doing to expose the essential instability of Puritan arguments. It was an effort crowned with a considerable measure of success, but Hooker was himself somewhat tied down by the circumstances of his time, and he sometimes left his analysis incomplete, subordinating, probably unconsciously, the quest of truth to a defence of the existing order in Church and State.

1.

2.

3.

NOTES TO "THE PROBLEM: CHURCH AND STATE".

1. "Let not any man imagine, that the bare and naked difference of a few ceremonies could either have kindled so much fire, or have caused it to flame so long."

[Hooker]. (Hooker E.P. VI. i.1).

"The question is not .... about trifles and things of no waight, as of variable ceremonies and matters of circumstances, which yet are to bee squared by the sacred canons of holy scripture, but about matters of no small importance, euen of the great & waightie cause of Christes kingdome, by what lawes and offices, his heritage is to be gouerned and protected." [Dudley Fenner in "A Counter-Poyson"]. ("A parte etc." p.418).

2. "The name of Church-polity .... containeth both government and also whatsoever besides belongeth to the ordering of the Church in public." (Hooker E.P. III, i.14).

3. "Al the corruptions which are in our Church this day, spring from no other head then this, that we have followed popish dreames and fantasies, as most stincking sinkes and channells, leaving the pure fountaines of the worde of God." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc. p.15).

"Out of this Cannon law, came al the Romish Hierarchie, .... and their servantes,.... by whome the Church as it were taken prisoner, is now of long time kept in prison and bondage ..... Let us send them backe from whence they came. .... Let us abrogate and abolish the authoritie of this Cannon law." [Travers]. (op.cit. p.16).

"This boke [Common Prayer] is an unperfected boke, culled and picked out of that popishe dunghil, the Portuise and Masse boke ful of all abominations. For some, and many of the contentes therein, be suche as are againste the worde of God." [Field and Wilcox]. ("Ad. Parlt.", fol. A.viii verso).

"A strawe for Popishe policie. We haue the worde of God to warrant vs to roote out all monumentes of superstition and Idolatrie." [Gilby]. ("A parte etc." p.14.).

"The man of sin, he of Rome, I meane, did corrupt and peruert the doctrine of Christ, so that not one free spot of it did remain. And in like manner touching the regiment of the Church and discipline." [Probably Harvey]. (op.cit. p.366).

"The awfull Ministerie of the word, and the right gouernment of the Church (being in deed outward meanes of our saluation) are matters of far greater waight and



5. importanace then ceremonies. .... The question is now, whether Christ shall be King in his Church .... or whether Antichrist the Pope shall still beare sway there, by his cursed canon law ?" [Field and Wilcox]. (op.cit. p.530).

3.5. "That the Tirannical government of the Pope, that Man of Sinne, with his cursed Canon lawe and filthy Ceremonies, may utterly be overthrowne and abolished." ("2nd Part. Reg.", Vol. II, p.209).

Cf. also Section B of the "Admonition to the Parliament" by Field and Wilcox:- "A view of Popishe abuses yet remayning in the English Church." (Ad. Parlt., fol. A.viii recto, to fol. C.i recto).

4. "They knowe not, I saie plainely, they know not, who being content with the doctrine of the Gospel, neglect discipline, that the disposition and nature of these twoe, is like the disposition of twoe sisters, who are twinnes: or of those brethren, of whom Hypocrates speaketh, who began to be sicke together, and to amend together: so that for the natural inclination and disposition of the one towards the other, they were affected one with the others health and infirmities." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc" p.14).

5. ~~large~~ "Our most gracious Princes late published proclamation / procured rather by the Bishops / then willingly sought for by her maiestie." (T.C. I, Foreword). This reference to an anti-Puritan proclamation was made in the Foreword from "The Printer to the Reader", initialled J.S. [John Strowd]. He also called the bishops "thys horned generation."
6. ~~large~~ "The greatnesse of your fault appeareth by this, that in so doing, you [i.e. the bishops] are the cause of all the ignorance, Atheisme, schismes, treasons, poperie, and vngodlinesse, that is to be founde in this lande." ("Dem. Disc.", p.2). "Are not you the cause of all schismes, that make a hotch pot of true religion and poperie." [Udall]. (op.cit. p.3).
7. ~~large~~ "They [the bishops] pretend much <sup>t</sup>y her maiestie is sore bent against us / and <sup>t</sup>y it is not so much their doing: if <sup>t</sup>y were so / then should they themselves deale for us to her maiestie / and cease <sup>t</sup>y course they have gon. But we know because it most toucheth them / they must hate us." ("Second Adm." p.61).

"Whether the said B.[ishops] or any of them ether by their speeches, letters, sollicitors, or other favorits have laboured by indirect, uncharitable, and

dangerous practices to incense her royall Matie (inclined with all godly zeal to further the gospell and the professors) to bringe into disgrace and discreditt with her diverse of her godly faithfull subjects ...." ("2nd Part Reg. Vol. II, pp.195, 196).

8. "They [the bishops] protest that they wishe these ragges, that are contended for, away with all their hartes, and yet they write that godly zeale doeth mooue the Prince to command them. .... I will not denie but that a zeale to God might mooue the Prince to cōmand these things: yet ought not the Bishops to confirme the Prince in an errour: by calling that godly, which for so much as it is not according to knowledge, therefore is to be discommended and counted vngodly." ("A parte etc" p.5).

"The Bishops should shewe the Prince and instruct hir, that though she meane well, yet shee is beguyled by folowing the iudgment of reason without grōūd of Gods word, and not upholde and defende that, wherein she is deceyued." (op.cit.,p.6).

"Our Prince .... as shee deserueth high commendation, for that good worke which the Lorde our God hath wrought by hir: so ought she not to be flattered in following of

hir fantasies, but rather sharpely to be reprobued ..."  
 [Dr Wyburne]. cf. the whole tract in "A parte etc."  
 pp. 1-11. (op.cit. p.10).

9. Cartwright speaks of "so wittie a Prince, and so wise counsellors ... Her Maiestie, according to the excellent learning, and amongst women without all comparison, which she hath, is delighted with things that are written in latin." ("Eccles. Disc." Introd. p.iii).

The Queen "seemeth none otherwyse, but that shee wolde have Gods matters to proceede." [Field and Wilcox]. ("Ad. Parlt." fol. C.ii recto).

11. Contrasts are to be found, as in Wyburne's words above (Note 8), and in William White, who "speaks of the Queen with great freedom and boldness". ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.100 n.2).

10. "Thys vnreasonable authoritie ouer the rest of the mynisters and clergy / came to the byshops and arch-bishops / when as the Pope dyd exempt hys shavelinges from the obedience / subiection / and iurisdiction of the Princes: now therfore that we be reddey to geue that subiection vnto the Prince / ..... / doe you thincke it an vnreasonable thing / that we desire to bee disburdened of the byshops and archbishops yoke / which the Pope



12. hath layde vpon our neckes ?" [Cartwright]. (T.C. I, p.128).

"Whereas you doe shrowd yourselues vnder the shadow of the Prince: saying, that shee created you and your authoritie: you doe peruersly beguile the world and your selues, & miserably abuse the name and goodnesse of our high Prince: for I pray you how manie hundred yeares, were your names and offices in full vertue and strength, before our Prince was borne ? Howe then will you make her the author of your iurisdiction ?" [Harvey]. ("A parte etc." p.367).

11. p.221 "For my parte I can not see, howe her Maiestie, according to the right of her prerogative, can truely (as she ought) be called chiefe gouernesse in causes ecclesiasticall, sithence her Maiestie in the chiefest point of that gouernment is made suppliant vnto the Archb. for the thinge whereby her auncestours lost their prerogative, by subjecting them selues vnto the sea of Rome, the verie same is translated from the sea of Rome to the sea of Canturburie." [A Gentleman in the Countrey]. ("A parte etc." p.141).

cf. Also Document 129 in "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.206.

12. "Also my L. in what a dilemma stande I, that yf I had not served that warrant I should have had all your displeasures which I was not able to beare, and usinge it for my shilde (beinge not forbidden by her maiestie) I am blamed for not takinge uppon me a matter, wherin she her selfe would not be seene." (Scott Pearson, p.230).

For other troubles experienced by Aylmer cf.

"2nd Part Reg. Vol. I, Docs. 157-160, pp.245-248.

13. "All which [faults and negligences] if you my Lords of the Clergy do not amend, I mean to depose you. Look ye therefore well to your charges." (Prothero "Documents", p.221). [The Queen's speech in Parliament, 1585]. cf. also Prothero "Documents", pp.208, 209.

"I have had more said unto me of the privye Counsell and of hir Ma<sup>tie</sup> her selfe againste you .... then I have had against any in the land." [The Bishop of Lichfield to Mr Axton]. ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.73.)

"In these things we charge you to be so careful and vigilant as by your negligence .... we be not forced to make some example or reformation of you according to your deserts." [The Queen's letter to Grindal against Propheisyngs, 1577]. (Prothero "Documents", p.206).

14. "The lawes of this Relme do not give to the Queene the Ecclesiasticall power, but is originallie incident to the reall crowne of Christian Kinges without geveing it by the Civill Lawes." ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.194).  
they (who are chosen) may be chosen by the King
15. "Which of them [prelates] have not preached againste the Popes two swordes: Nowe whether they use them not themselves?" [Field and Wilcox]. ("Ad. Parlt." fol. B.v verso).  
civil lawes, but they have not used them  
of the Kinges, and often times have they have  
suffered to be chosen by the King
16. Travers concludes a lengthy discussion of this theme ["Eccles. Disc.", pp. 77 ff.] with the words "Therefore, seeing the Lord God under the law, being about to plant the Priesthood as a tree, hard by the Magistrate his neighbours ground, knowing wel what the nature of this tree was .... severed it by a most great distance .... from the Magistrates ground that lay hard by: [the reference is to the Old Testament code] let godly Magistrates diligently take heede, being admonished both by the ordinance of the most wise God, and the  
18. example of the Romaine Empire, that they suffer the  
19. Bishops to challenge nothing unto them within their ground, nor secreatly to roote themselves within the same, lest they be afterwards compelled (as we reade many Emperors have done) to strive with them for their owne right and patrimony." ("Eccles. Disc." pp.82, 83).

17. The Puritan Discipline "neither punisheth any thing which belongeth to the courts of civill officers, nor yet punisheth with civill punishment (as of goods, or of body) any fault which it correcteth: ... whereas they (who doe object this) may be charged with both faults. For this Discipline of theirs both dealeth in civil causes, and by right appertaining to the courts of the Magistrats, and often times those (whom they have authoritie to correct) they punish by the purse, or imprisonment .... (Most weighty accusations, worthy for the hainousnes of them to be dealt within the kings bench, as offending so highly against the state and especially consisteth in those things which belong to authority of the Prince and Magistrate.)" (op.cit. pp.168, 169).
18. "In all things of the church / they shall not meddle wyth the civill magistrates office / nor wyth any other punishment but admonition / and excommunication of the obstinate." ("Second Adm." p.47).
19. One Puritan "cannot thinke that ... the ecclesiastical authoritie geven to the pastors, teachers, and elders, doeth depende upon maiestrates." ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.204).



20. "If the question be / whether princes/and magistrates be necessary in the church / it holdeth / that the vse of them / is more then of the sunne / wythout the whych the world cã not stand." [Cartwright] (T.C. I, p.2).
22. "The Magistrates have this proper and peculier to ministered by such as ought to administer the same, and them selves above the rest of the faithfull, to set in order and establish the estate of the Church by their authoritie, and to preserve and mainteine it according to Gods will being once established." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." p.195).
21. "Who knoweth not that the office of the Magistrate especially consisteth in those things which belong to our life and to our goods, and hath not to do with the holie ceremonies, but onely to see by his authoritie that it be administred by them, by whom, and in what manner it ought to be by the word of God, but that he administer nothing himselfe ?" [Travers]. (op.cit. p.82).
24. "The Prince ruleth in the common wealth hir selfe, and in the church of God seeth that all be ruled of the Lord." [Dering]. ("A parte etc." p.80).
25. cf. Beza's opinion: "By what right, whether ye respect the word of God, or all the olde Canons, may either the civil Magistrate by himself, where congregations are already erected and established, bring in uppon them any

- new rites, or abrogate the olde ..... I have not yet learned." ("Ad. Parlt." fol. D.iv recto).
22. Magistrates "ought to provide, and see that the service of God be established as he hath appointed, and administered by such as ought to administer the same, and afterwards preserved in the same simplicitie and sinceritie undefiled." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." p.195).
23. "The supream Magistrate, according to the high authoritie which God hath committed vnto him ouer all Churches in his Dominions, but lawfully may and by duetie ought, not onely to disanull what-soeuer election the Elders and people haue vnlawfully made, but also by his ciuill preeminence to compell them to make a new election according to the word of God." [Fenner]. ("A parte etc." p.433).
24. "The civil magistrate / the nurse and foster father of the church / shall doe well to provyde some sharpe punyshment for those that contemne thys censure and discipline of the church." ("Second Adm." p.49).
25. "The Magistrate to whom God hath committed this lawfull authoritie of the officers of the Church." charge is bounde to provide workmen, as soone as is possible." ("Eccles. Disc." p.99).

"If we thinke good to keepe still the tenthes and to pay the Ministers of them, the magistrate must provide for this by his authoritie." [Travers]. (op.cit. p.128).

cf. "Eccles. Disc." pp.114-119.

26. "Doth it not require a merveilous great diligence  
27. and singular knowledge in the holy scriptures to prescribe all orders and degrees of men what they ought to doe ? what is fit for everie one and what every mans duetie is ? to declare the duetie of kings and magistrates ?" (op.cit. p.95).

28. "Neither let Magistrates think (although in respect of their civil authority the Church be subiect to them) that in this behalf they are to be exempted from this precept and commandement of the Apostle, who chargeth every one to be subiect to those who in the Lord are set over them. For seeing they ought to be careful as well of the salvation of the Magistrate as of others, and that the soule of the Magistrate, as well as of the rest, is committed to their charge; they must also as well as the rest submit themselves and be obedient to the iust and lawfull authoritie of the officers of the Church." [Travers]. (op.cit. p.193).

29. "The Prince therefore ought to obey the Lawe, that must bee pronounced by the mouth of the Minister. [concerning ceremonies] And in these thinges he ought to commande nothing on his owne head, but seeke at the mouth of the Minister, what he ought to commande herein." ("A parte etc." p.48).

27. "Iustice may be as well accused for doing wrong / as thys doctryne / for bringing in disorder / whose whole worke is to prouyde / that nothing be done out of place / out of time / or otherwise / then the condytion of euery mans calling will beare: ..... Thys doctrine was in times past / euen by their confession / which wryte against it / a friend vnto princes and magistrates / when princes / and magistrates were enemies vnto it; and can it nowe be an enemy vnto princes / and magistrates / whych are frendes vnto it ?" [Cartwright]. (T.C. I, pp.1,2).

cf. many other passages by many Puritan authors.

28. "As for overthrowe of the whole state / truely Englande were in a straunge case / if the state therof / either in encrease or decay / dependeth upon the maintenance or overthrowe of the Bishops Lordships and livings." ("Exhort." fol. A.ii recto).



29. "Her Majesty, being the supreme governor of all persons and causes in these her dominions, hath established this kind of government, in the hands of the bishops, which thou and thy fellows so strive against; and they being set in authority for the exercising of this government by her Majesty, thou dost not strive against them, but her Majesty's person, seeing they cannot alter the government which the Queen hath laid upon them."  
(Prothero "Documents", p.443).

30. "It is her maiesties authoritie we flye to / as the supreme governour in all causes / and over all persones within her dominions appoynted by God / and we flie to the lawes of this realme / the bonds of all peace and good orders in thys land. And we besече her maiestie to have <sup>e</sup>y hearing of thys matter of Gods / and to take the defence of it upon her. And to fortifie it by law / that it may be received by common order throughout her dominions. For though the orders be / and ought to be drawne out of the booke of God / yet it is hir maiestie that by hir princely authoritie should see every of these things put in practise / and punish those that neglect them."  
("Second Adm." p.60).

"No other thing ... doe we will or desire, then that your aboundance (i.e. of the bishops) should supplie the want of our Churches, & that assured by a strong law."

This looks to Parliament to protect Church property.

The perusal of Puritan pamphlets is often a rather tedious task, because there is little real development ("A parte etc." p.328).

cf. also Travers in "Eccles. Disc." p.196 and the of thought in them. The argument is set forth at the numerous petitions and supplications in "2nd Part Reg.". beginning, often as a mere statement, and the remainder of the space is taken up with the application of the conclusion to the details of the existing situation of the day. It seems that the Puritans were more eager to score points than to make clear to themselves that for which they stood. They were desirous of practical reforms, for some of which there was admittedly much need, and in their eagerness to proceed with the work they neglected to question themselves too closely as to the implications of the reasons they gave for reforming. They preferred action to thought. For the greater part of the reign of Elizabeth their opponents in argument were equally heedless of philosophic background, and the controversy, though bitter and acrimonious, led to little in the way of conclusions.

There was a reason for the lack of development in the disputations of the Puritans. The Puritan ideal was static. Those who upheld it believed sincerely in the

### GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN THE CONTROVERSY

The perusal of Puritan pamphlets is often a rather tedious task, because there is little real development of thought in them. The argument is set forth at the beginning, often as a mere statement, and the remainder of the space is taken up with the application of the conclusion to the details of the existing situation of the day. It seems that the Puritans were more eager to score points than to make clear to themselves that for which they stood. They were desirous of practical reforms, for some of which there was admittedly much need, and in their eagerness to proceed with the work they neglected to question themselves too closely as to the implications of the reasons they gave for reforming. They preferred action to thought. For the greater part of the reign of Elizabeth their opponents in argument were equally heedless of philosophic background, and the controversy, though bitter and acrimonious, led to little in the way of conclusions.

There was a reason for the lack of development in the disputations of the Puritans. The Puritan ideal was static. Those who upheld it believed sincerely in the

possibility of the revelation of absolute truth. Indeed this had been revealed in Scripture as far as the affairs of the church were concerned. Man's task was to discover perfection, to establish it, and to uphold it firmly. Once that had been accomplished, all change was detrimental<sup>(1)</sup>. Within the sphere of Ecclesiastical Polity the Puritans claimed, as might be expected, that their 'Discipline' was perfect, that it was the ideal<sup>(2)</sup>. The Puritan system ought to be adopted everywhere and maintained for all time<sup>(3)</sup>. Cartwright, though he granted that circumstances might alter cases in politics, made no such allowance for religious matters<sup>(4)</sup>.

It must not be supposed, however, that the Puritans claimed to be the first discoverers of the perfect system of church government. Nothing annoyed and pained them more than the accusation that they were innovators<sup>(5)</sup>. Again they took their stand upon a sentence from Bishop Jewel. "Diximus nos ... ex sacris libris, quos scimus non posse fallere, certam quandam religionis formam quaesivisse, et ad veterum patrum atque apostolorum primitivam ecclesiam, hoc est, ad primordia atque initia, tanquam ad fontes rediisse."<sup>36</sup> The apologist of the English Reformation himself had claimed that that

---

(x) Jewel, Apol. p.46.



reformation was but a renovation on the lines of Scripture and the practice of the early Church. The Puritans merely sought to make the renovation complete, according to their ideas, and to bring the Church of England into full conformity with the early pattern, which they found set forth in the Bible<sup>(6)</sup>. Even as the Bible had been used to overthrow the Papal claims, so would Puritans use it to overcome the Established Church. They could not conceive of any higher standard.

In defence of their attempted renovation the Puritans had to impugn all the changes that had been made during the intervening centuries. These were traced by them to human invention. For various reasons, some of them seemingly valid, changes had been made in the practices of the church<sup>ⓧ</sup>. It was only the experience of such changes in more developed forms that proved them evil. The Puritan conclusion was that no alteration, however justifiable it might appear at the time, could be permissible in the ideal Ecclesiastical Polity. So it came to pass that Puritans on the whole were suspicious of every human criterion of judgment. They minimised the capabilities of the human intellect. The weight of tradition, the influence of great men or of men of learning,

---

(ⓧ) cf. "Eccles. Disc." pp.77-79.

the power of reason, were all to be mistrusted<sup>(7)</sup>. A man might be mistaken in his opinions, however high his rank or prestige or scholarship<sup>(8)</sup>. Tradition might embody error as well as truth. Human reason might easily be misled both in presuppositions and in arguments. There was nothing in man which could stand in opposition to the Word of God, the foundation, inspiration, and defence of all Puritan claims.

Such reasoning proved very effective when used to attack Roman Catholic claims, or any theory that seemed to lead to tyranny. As a negative and destructive argument its force was great. The Puritans however were not concerned merely to uproot various elements of error and falsehood. They had a positive programme which they desired to impose upon England. They found in the Bible a form of church organization: what appeared in the Bible was the standard of perfection: therefore their plan of church organization, which they claimed to be biblical, was the perfect scheme. It did not however commend itself to those in authority, many of whom denied that it was scriptural. So they sought to buttress their arguments by appeals to the practice of the ancient church, as pictured in the early Fathers' writings<sup>II</sup>, and to the

---

(\*) cf. 2nd Part Reg., Vol. I, p.68.

practice of the "best reformed churches" of their own day<sup>π</sup>. They were not above references to pagan philosophers<sup>§</sup>. Thus the Puritan case, in theory wholly deduced and proved from Scripture, was usually supported by mention of the examples of the early and of the reformed churches<sup>(9)</sup> - in fact an appeal to that human tradition and learning which some of them so derided. The difficulty was that the "Word of God" did not speak clearly to the conditions of their century, nor could they find completely and unequivocally set out in the pages of the Bible that which they sought<sup>(10)</sup>. The greater part of the lengthy volumes produced by Cartwright and Whitgift between 1572 and 1577 is occupied by tedious discussions as to the interpretation of passages of scripture or of extracts from early patristic writings. The last word really lay with human interpretation and authority, and the logic of facts forced the Puritans to a virtual acknowledgement of this. There were also examples of reformation on Puritan lines in other countries, particularly Switzerland, where Geneva was the supreme instance, Germany, France, and Scotland<sup>(11)</sup>. To these also Puritans appealed, in spite of their disregard for human

---

(π) cf. op.cit. Vol. II, p.213. "Eccles. Disc.", p.52.  
 "Ad. Parlt." fol. A.i v. et mult. al.  
 (§) cf. "Eccles. Disc." pl85.

wisdom. Of course to them the establishing of a presbyterian form of church in any place was a proof that God was at work. Some of them read into history most remarkable facts<sup>(12)</sup>. The statements sounded very well, and seemed very plausible, but only to those who deliberately shut their eyes to the real state of Europe. To rulers who had to thread the tortuous labyrinths of foreign politics the arguments were self-condemnatory. They had none of the weight which a stand upon the "Word of God" could give, and they made their authors more suspect in high places. The appeal to contemporary illustrations was in fact a weak point in the Puritan case: it hardly needed to be pointed out by their opponents. To its weakness, however, Puritans were strangely blind: they saw only what they wanted to see in Geneva or Scotland. Hooker had little difficulty in disposing of the plea: in the Preface to his work he outlined the course of the Genevan reformation, and thus surmounted the most formidable of the examples adduced. ~~a distant goal, and~~ There was indeed a certain disregard of circumstances in Puritanism. Puritans claimed to be freed from the trammels of the 'here and now' by their recognition of the perfect ideal. Nevertheless they had to compromise. Whatever efforts a man may make, he cannot escape from



his past history nor from his present environment. Puritans in translating their ideals into a practical policy had to take account of the realities of their time. They attacked the Canon Law and popish practices because of their past associations: is it straining a point to suggest that if monasteries had not been a feature of Roman organization there would have been a number of monks and nuns among the Puritans? Asceticism would probably have had for them a strong appeal; they were austere enough in other directions. The force of custom, the weight of past tradition, still influenced them in spite of their desire to abolish these influences. They wished to spring in one leap to the goal they sought, but their limbs were fettered.

Hooker was a man of an altogether different character. His guiding light was not a static ideal but the principle of reasonableness and orderliness, which would be contravened by all sudden changes<sup>(13)</sup>. Where the Puritan walked with his eyes fixed on a distant goal, and stumbled over the obstacles lying in his path, Hooker chose to watch his steps. He had a strong historical sense. He could not conceive of any absolute ideal for the guidance of human action, unalterable, without reference to circumstances, of the nature of the Puritan arguments required to prove the case for alteration would

plan of Discipline: whatever had a bearing on human society was for him dependent on conditions in society<sup>(14)</sup>. If conditions changed, the rule was to be changed correspondingly. Human nature was capable of making changes for the better by its own light, even in ecclesiastical matters, which Hooker treated as a subsection of the whole sphere of human life, not as a separated department sundered from the rest. There was a wide field for the exercise in life of human reason, and reason was a valid criterion<sup>(15)</sup>. Hooker might have found a text in Puritan tracts, even as Puritans could appeal to Jewel. The law of nature<sup>(16)</sup> and the light of reason<sup>(17)</sup> were both definitely admitted as bases of argument by Puritans, in spite of all their disparagements of the human intellect.

His reverence for the intellectual capacities of men naturally led Hooker to respect tradition. He was defending a system which had arisen from a conservative measure of reform, retaining as much continuity with the past as possible, and it was congenial to his nature to attribute much authority to what was established and to appeal constantly to the verdict of past experience<sup>(18)</sup>. He would not however make a fetish of the past<sup>(19)</sup>; his teleological outlook<sup>(20)</sup> prevented that: but his mind naturally looked backwards as well as forwards. The arguments required to prove the case for alteration would

have to be exceptionally strong and weighty, even where past practice was based on no apparent reason<sup>(21)</sup>. In making changes "Festina lente" was Hooker's motto. Very clear proof of necessity was required, since the act of altering had a disturbing influence, and the institution affected might be more endangered by the radical cure of a slight weakness than by the continuance of the evil<sup>(22)</sup>. Unnecessary changes of law were a danger to law itself, for they diminished the respect of persons for Law<sup>(23)</sup>. Thus it was that Hooker attacked the practical side of the Puritan campaign with the weapon of expediency, the natural concomitant of a regard for human authority and tradition<sup>x</sup>.

In the matter of appeal to the Early Fathers and other writers of antiquity Hooker yielded nothing to Cartwright himself. The fruits of the Renaissance were brought under contribution and the English Reformation was set in relation to them by him. His reverence for the past is well illustrated by the wide range of his examples. Philosophers, poets, politicians, as well as theologians and Scripture, were quoted and utilized extensively. Hooker's method of argument enabled him to make full and good use of his extensive knowledge of

---

(x) cf. Hooker E.P. Pref. viii.

Greek, Latin, and Mediaeval literature. He sought to rest his case on as broad and complete a basis as possible. Puritanism, if consistent, would have rested all upon one point - the all-sufficiency of the "Word of God": its ecclesiastical ideals were static. Hooker argued that "the Church had not been stereotyped for all time in the pages of the New Testament; it was a living body, able to adapt its institutions from time to time to the varying needs of different ages." His doctrine, if stated in modern terms, is that of the organism adapting itself to its environment; and it was developed in a style as massive and rich as that of Bacon."<sup>x</sup>

2. "Of which place [1 Timothy 3:15], I gather, first that almighty God and our Saviour Jesus Christ are the authors of that Discipline which Saint Paul has taught in that Epistle .... I note further also that this order of Discipline is constant and unchangeable. ... Last of all that it is no commandment belonging to one certaine time, but perpetuall, and pertaining to all times and states of the Church." [Traversus] (1623, p.13).
3. "A demonstration of the breadth of that Discipline

---

(x) Tanner T.C.D. p.171.

ment of his Church, in all times and places, until the end of the world." [Wall] ("Dec. Res." title, p.1).



NOTES TO "GUIDING PRINCIPLES".

---

1. "Those Kingdoms and common weales have alwaies most notably florished, and longest continued, which first of al were set in good order of government, and afterwarde kepte the same without any alteration or chaunge. As contrariwise the destruction of greatest common weales and most flourishing estates have followed, where either the order of government was ill appointed in the beginning: or else being wel begun, was afterwarde altered and neglected." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." p.1).
2. "Of which place [1 Timothy 6<sup>13</sup>], I gather, first that almightie God and our Saviour Jesus Christ are the authors of that Discipline which Sainct Paul had taught in that Epistle .... I note further also that this order of Discipline is constant and unchangeable: ... Last of all that it is no commaundement belonging to anie certaine time, but perpetuall, and pertaining to all times and states of the Church." [Travers]. (op.cit. p.13).
3. "A demonstration of the trueth of that Discipline which Christ hath prescribed in his worde for the government of his Church, in all times and places, vntill the end of the world." [Udall]. ("Dem. Disc." Title, p.1).

4. "For so much as there be diuers common wealthes / and diuers formes of common wealthes / and all good / it falleth oute / that the offices and dignities whych are good in one common wealth / are not good in an other .... But that can not be sayde of the church / whych is but one and uniforme / and hathe the same lawes and forme of gouernment throughout the worlde." [Cartwright] (T.C. I, p.121).
5. "Sed ego homo quorundam sermone, honori tuo νεωτεροποιός suspectus, causam istam antiquissimam, et cum Christi et Apostolorum ecclesiis natam, eandem in novitatis suspicionem induco. Non sum, non sum, (vir honoratissime) νεωτεροποιός ..... Sed cur ego novitati defensionem meditarer, cum causa 1570 fere annos agens, ipsa sit antiquitate veneranda, et ipse tu disertus plane esses, si pro novitate, contra antiquitatem velles dicere." [Cartwright to Cecil in 1570]. (Scott Pearson, p.428).
6. "Thys is no innouation / but a renouation / and the doctrine not new / but renued / no stranger / but borne in Sion / whereunto (it being before vniustly banyshed) ought now of ryght to bee restored." [Cartwright]. (T.C. I, p.1.).

Field and Wilcox complain of things "which the church of God in the Apostles times never knew (and therefore not to be used) nay (which we are sure of) were and are mannes devices, brought in long after the puritie of the primitive church." ("Ad. Parlt." fol. A.iv verso).

7. "By searching the discipline of the Church from men, and from the Canon law, we do wrong to Christ .... and open a spring and fountaine of errors in the Church." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." p.70).

"Bring unto the reading hereof [the "Eccles. Disc."] a mind void of all affection, neither hindred with any error of custome, nor dismaied with the vaine noise and pompe of Bishops .... try the weight of every argument, not by the deceitfull scales of men, or of the greatest, but by the authority of the word of God." [Cartwright]. (op.cit. Introd. p.v).

That "the argumentes of both sides / may be waighed / not with the chaungeable waightes of custome / of tyme / of men / .... but with the iust balances of the incorruptible / and unchangeable worde of God." [Cartwright]. (T.C. I, p.7.).

"If thys be a sufficient prooffe of things to say / suche a Doctor sayde so / suche a councell decreed so /

8. there is almost nothing so true but I can impugne /  
 nothing so false / but I can make true." [Cartwright].  
 (op.cit. p.29). cf. T.C. II, pp.xviii to xx.  
 "A corrupt and poysoned water / drawn out of a  
 stinking puddel of the filthy dunghill of mannes braynes."  
 ("Exhort." fol. B.i, verso).

9. "Cogge not therefore / nor foiste / neither bumbaste  
 it with Rhetoricke / or mans authority to make a shew."  
 (op.cit. fol. B.ii verso).

"Antiquitie may deceive us, nay we see it hathe de-  
 ceived us ..... it is not true to say / it is old / ther-  
 fore it is good." (op.cit. fol. C.i verso).

10. "There is nothing that doeth more hurt and hinder  
 true religion, then mens traditions.... Mens doctrine  
 doeth let the keeping of Gods commandementes." ("A parte  
 etc." p.43).

"The vncertaine and deceivable waights of humane  
 constitutions" opposed to "the infallible Oracles of Gods  
 most holy testimonies." [Fenner]. (op.cit. p.418).

"Christe his religion and ministry is never more  
 glorious then when it is sett forth simplie in his natyve  
 and naturall bewtie without the abhominable paintinges  
 and inventions of man." ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.66).



8. "Peradventure some of you will be persuaded / bicause  
a bishop an olde man / a very learned man saith so /  
bicause this state hath continued a great while many  
yeares amongst good fathers: do not so / <sup>t</sup>y is no warrant  
of <sup>e</sup>y word." ("Exhort." fol. C.ii verso).  
cf. T.C. I, p.4, and Second Adm. p.4).
9. "All men do see / how uniustly we be accused of  
singularity / which propound nothing / that the scriptures  
do not teache / the wryters bothe olde / and new for the  
most part affirme / the examples of the primitiue churches /  
and of those which are at these dayes confirme." [Cart-  
wright]. (T.C. I, p.7).
10. "When the question is whether God have delivered in  
Scripture (as they [the Puritans] affirm he hath) a com-  
plete, particular, immutable form of church polity, why  
take they that other both presumptuous and superfluous  
labour to prove he should have done it; there being no way  
in this case to prove the deed of God, saving only by  
producing that evidence wherein he hath done it ?"  
[Hooker]. (Hooker E.P. III, xi.21).  
cf. E.P. Pref. iv.1; I, xiv.2; III, ii.1.

11. "Is a reformation good for France ? and can it be evill for Englande ? Is discipline meete for Scotland ? and is it unprofytable for this realme ?" [Field and Wilcox]. ("Ad.Parlt." fol. A.vii recto).

12. "In latter times whole states and governments haue receiued it [discipline] with one consent, as diuers of the States of Germanie, and those that haue refused it, loe their confusions ! They must condemne worthe Churches and whole countries that haue embraced it and found it the onely bonde of peace, the bane of heresie, the punisher of sinne, and maintainer of righteousness. The harmonie of so manie famous Churches in so many partes of the worlde, consenting in the chiefest points and substance both ought to bring great authoritie to it, and also evident testimonie of the authour thereof, who hath framed it with suche wisdom, that it may serue all times, places, and peoples, without any impeachments of ciuill states and governments, and without anie danger to Princes or their kingdomes: All of them such as God hath raised vp, to be the most singuler instruments of spreading foorth his Gospell: M. Calvine, Beza, Viret, Peter Martir, Bucer, Tremelius, Iunius, Knox, Cartwright, and such like, a great number." ("A parte etc." p.302).

13. "All things that are, have some operation not violent nor casual. Neither doth any thing ever begin to exercise the same, without some fore-conceived end for which it worketh. And the end which it worketh for is not obtained, unless the work be also fit to obtain it by. For unto every end every operation will not serve. That which doth assign unto each thing the kind, that which doth appoint the form and measure, of working, the same we term a Law. So that no certain end could ever be attained, unless the actions whereby it is attained were regular; that is to say, made suitable, fit, and correspondent unto their end, by some canon, rule or law." (Hooker E.P. I, ii.1).
14. "Laws that were made for men or societies or churches, in regard of their being such as they do not always continue, but may perhaps be clean otherwise a while after, and so may require to be otherwise ordered than before; the laws of God himself which are of this nature, no man endued with common sense will ever deny to be of a different constitution from the former [i.e. permanent laws], in respect of ..... mutability." (op.cit. I, xv.3).  
(100. "Why may we not presume that God doth even call for such change or alteration as the very condition of things themselves doth make necessary?" (Hooker E.P. III, x.4).

14. "God never ordained any thing that could be bettered. Yet many things he hath that have been changed, and that for the better. That which succeedeth as better now when change is requisite, had been worse when that which now is changed was instituted." (op.cit. III x.5). cf. also
17. "The proofs thereof [Discipline] out of the Scriptures, the evidence of it by the light of reason rightlie
15. "By force of the light of Reason, wherewith God illuminateth every one which cometh into the world, men being enabled to know truth from falsehood, and good from evil, do thereby learn in many things what the will of God is; which will himself not revealing by any extraordinary means unto them, but they by natural discourse attaining the knowledge thereof, seem the makers of those laws which indeed are his, and they but only the finders of them out." (op.cit. I, viii.3).
- "The natural measure whereby to judge our doings, is the sentence of Reason, determining and setting down what is good to be done." (op.cit. I, viii.8).
- "The Law of Reason or human Nature is that which men by discourse of natural Reason have rightly found out themselves to be all for ever bound unto in their actions." (loc.cit.). as to another the light of natural understanding." (op.cit. I, viii.11) cf. I, vii.6.



16. "If the law of God were nothing knowne to mankind:  
yet the very law of nature teacheth vs sufficiently, that  
man is borne one for another, and neuer a one for him  
selfe." ("A parte etc." p.371).
17. "The proofs thereof [Discipline] out of the Scrip-  
tures, the euidence of it by the light of reason rightlie  
ruled, and the testimonies that haue been giuen thereunto"  
etc. [Udall]. ("Dem. Disc." Title, p.1). cf. T.C. I.131.
18. We may not "lightly esteem what hath been allowed as  
fit in the judgment of antiquity, and by the long con-  
tinued practice of the whole Church; from which unneces-  
sarily to swerve, experience hath never as yet found it  
safe." (Hooker E.P. V, vii.1). cf. V, xx.5 and V, vii.  
2,3,4.
19. "The things which so long experience of all ages  
hath confirmed and made profitable, let not vs presume  
to condemn as follies and toys, because we sometimes  
know not the cause and reason of them." (op.cit. IV,  
i.3).
19. "Lewd and wicked custom ... may be of force even in  
plain things to smother the light of natural understand-  
ing." (op.cit. I, viii.11) cf. I, vii.6.

20. "All other things besides [God] are somewhat in possibility, which as yet they are not in act. And for this cause there is in all things an appetite or desire, whereby they incline to something which they may be; and when they are it, they shall be perfecter than now they are." (op.cit. I, v.1).
21. "In things the fitness whereof is not of itself apparent, nor easy to be made sufficiently manifest unto all, yet the judgment of antiquity concurring with that which is received may induce them to think it not unfit, who are not able to allege any known weighty inconvenience which it hath, or to take any strong exception against it." (Hooker E.P. V, vii.4).
22. "If we have neither voice from heaven that so pronounceth of them, neither sentence of men grounded upon such manifest and clear proof, that they in whose hands it is to alter them may likewise infallibly even in heart and conscience judge them so: upon necessity to urge alteration is to trouble and disturb without necessity." ..... "No doubt but to bear a tolerable sore is better than to venture on a dangerous remedy." (op.cit. IV, xiv.2).

23. cf. Whole of E.P. IV, xiv.1 ending "What have we to induce men unto the willing obedience and observation of laws, but the weight of so many men's judgment as have with deliberate advice assented thereunto; the weight of that long experience, which the world hath had thereof with consent and good liking? So that to change any such law must needs with the common sort impair and weaken the force of those grounds, whereby all laws are made effectual." (op.cit. IV, xiv.1).
- One of the vital problems of politics and political thought which were becoming prominent in the Tudor period was the problem of sovereignty. Where did the supreme authority in a community reside? What was to be the ultimate test or standard? Was the ruler of a country to have full power over all that went on in it, or was any section of the inhabitants to be wholly or partly exempt? Hooker and the Puritans naturally dealt with the question from an ecclesiastical standpoint, but in view of the actual facts, of the 'supreme ecclesiastical governorship' of the crown, their discussions were pertinent to general political theory. The problem had been discussed in the Middle Ages in an ecclesiastical and theological context, with particular reference to the struggle between the Imperial power and the Papacy, but administrative weakness and local independence combined with the magnitude of the problem considered - universal sovereignty - made the discussion for the most part academic. The development of national states in Western Europe gave the problem a new setting; the improvement

in administrative control and the absorption by national  
governments of THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY by local lordships  
gave it a new setting: the improvement

One of the vital problems of politics and political thought which were becoming prominent in the Tudor period was the problem of sovereignty. Where did the supreme authority in a community reside? What was to be the ultimate test or standard? Was the ruler of a country to have full power over all that went on in it, or was any section of the inhabitants to be wholly or partly exempt? Hooker and the Puritans naturally dealt with the question from an ecclesiastical standpoint, but in view of the actual facts, of the 'supreme ecclesiastical governorship' of the crown, their discussions were pertinent to general political theory. The problem had been discussed in the Middle Ages in an ecclesiastical and theological context, with particular reference to the struggle between the Imperial power and the Papacy, but administrative weakness and local independence combined with the magnitude of the problem considered - universal sovereignty - made the discussion for the most part academic. The development of national states in Western Europe gave the problem a new setting: the improvement



in administrative methods and the assertion by national governments of a reality of control over local lordships gave it an urgency hitherto absent. In Tudor England more than anywhere else were these new conditions found: and the efforts to solve the problem of sovereignty made notable advance in the work of Hooker, who in England was almost contemporary with the great continental writers Bodin and Althusius. If they were to operate together,

The Puritan controversy was in the first instance ecclesiastical. The Puritan protagonists were not political theorists, and their views on political organization appeared only incidentally or by implication in the course of their ecclesiastical theorizing. They accepted the organization of the state on the secular side as it existed, and sought to change only the ecclesiastical framework. This involved the separation of 'Church' and 'State'; in some measure at least. On the practical side the controversy was not between Church and State: it was a contest between the State and the ecclesiastical organization maintained by the State on the one side, and, on the other, a section of the community desiring a different ecclesiastical constitution. Since the Puritans however did not recognize themselves as other than representatives of the 'Church', they raised a number of

questions. Was the Prince head of the Church as of the State, or not ? What was the meaning of "supreme governor in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes" ? In the machinery of government, what were the relations of the secular and the ecclesiastical arms ? Were they absolutely without concern the one for the other ? No one in the sixteenth century could sincerely answer that question affirmatively. If they were to operate together, to which did the initiative pertain ? Which was to be the directive force in the combination ? There was general agreement that the 'magistrate' had a part to play in ecclesiastical affairs, but there agreement ended, even among the Puritans. The Puritans found circumstances very difficult to surmount, as is shown by this lack of agreement among themselves on this question of the relation of the Church to the State and the Prince. The general position was that they wished further reformation in the Church, but were not desirous of disobeying the civil authority. Moreover they hoped for the support of the civil authority for the church after it had been modified. The uncertainty and difficulty is reflected in the variety of Puritan views. Almost all shades of opinion, from a mere distaste for one or two items in the established order to a desire for complete and immediate reform

heedless of conditions, are to be found expressed in the documents of Tudor Puritanism. Church and State were connected, and yet they differed; the varying proportions of connection and distinction form a complete scale from standard orthodoxy to definite separatism.

It may seem strange that Cartwright and his fellows were so persistent in assuming that they were entitled to argue on behalf of the national church. The analogy of present-day political parties and their relation to the state may assist to clarify the situation: it affords an illuminating parallel. "Episcopacy being in the view adopted by the puritans no essential part of the church, its repudiation involved in their minds no idea of separation from the church. They considered themselves quite as much entitled to remain churchmen in order to make the church presbyterian, as they were to remain Englishmen in order to make the monarchy constitutional."<sup>x</sup> "We make no separation from the church / we go about to separte all those thyngs / that offend in the church."<sup>s</sup> Belief in one national church, and only one, all embracing within the limits of the nation, was axiomatic. The Church was a true church, and was therefore

---

(x) Pollard "History", p.359.

(s) T.C. I, p.16.

the right and lawful church in which every Englishman should be included. Though it was imperfect in many ways, yet there was sufficient of the light of truth in it for it to be tolerable.<sup>(1)</sup> Most Puritans yielded a measure of conformity sufficient to escape deprivation, being encouraged in this attitude by their continental advisers<sup>(2)</sup>. It is true that Cartwright at first championed separatists<sup>(3)</sup>, but age and experience and above all the rise of Brownism made him change his tone. Instead of upholding "conventiclers" against the church he took up the cudgels on behalf of the Church of England against the separatists, and defended his own position.<sup>(\*)</sup> "This does not mean that he renounced his ardent hope that the English Church might become Presbyterian, but that in the face of those who condemned it outright he came forward as a champion of the Establishment and proclaimed the doctrine that the proper way in which to achieve a further reformation of it was to accept things as they were and labour for improvement by gradual and constitutional means from within the Church."<sup>(§)</sup> He asserted that his ministry among the Merchant Adventurers had been legally in order, that he had been faithful to

---

(\*) cf. Scott Pearson, pp.211-222.

(§) op.cit. p.222.



the Church of England in the performance of his functions abroad<sup>(4)</sup>. His gratification at Burghley's support in 1585 "was due to his anxiety to impress upon the anti-Presbyterians the fact of his devotion to the welfare of the Church, which his opponents thought he was seeking to destroy."<sup>x</sup> Puritans bitterly resented and eagerly denied accusations of separatism<sup>§</sup>.

As Puritans affirmed themselves to be faithful members of the Church of England, so they made assertions of their loyalty to the State. They zealously proclaimed their adherence to the Crown in all secular matters. None could have been more vehement in defence of Queen and country against foreign assaults or dangers from Roman Catholicism. Many must have served in the forces, or shared in the naval exploits of the reign. No one could pray more earnestly for Elizabeth, and all that she stood for against Rome, than the Puritan clergyman. The Puritans were sincere nationalists in their own eyes, eager for the welfare and prosperity of England. Again taking their leader and figurehead as example, consider Thomas Cartwright. He was much distressed because of the Queen's attitude to him and to the views he championed<sup>(5)</sup>. He

---

(x) op.cit. p.230.

(§) cf. "2nd Part Reg." Vol.II, Doc. No.204, pp.70-87.

felt his responsibilities to his country<sup>(6)</sup>. He and his colleagues said they paid great attention to the laws of the land and took pains to observe them carefully<sup>(7)</sup>. They claimed to have offered no opposition to the exercise of power by the civil magistrate<sup>(8)</sup>, and denied the charges that were brought against them upon this score<sup>(9)</sup>. The King of a country was indeed its supreme law-giver<sup>(10)</sup>. One Puritan indeed roundly declared that "without doubt the Queen possesses all authority; long may she continue to do so without contradiction and to curious sifting and enquire of the maner or limitations of the same"<sup>x</sup>. The confession of faith made by Field and Wilcox "Of civill Magistrates"<sup>(11)</sup> was a very sweeping declaration of allegiance, but also a very characteristic Puritan statement.

There is one point to be noted in connection with almost all these affirmations. They appear as after-thoughts, subsequent to some impugning of the degree of loyalty offered by the Puritans. They are defensive statements, not free uncalled for expressions of opinion. They show that Puritans tended to take their loyalty for granted, and had not investigated thoroughly the problem raised for them by the relations of church and state in

---

(x) "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.183.

(z) Scott Pearson, p.471.

England. For when it came to the crucial moment, all such general protestations were subject to qualification. Vagueness of language and an absence of exact definitions of terms were essential to sweeping declarations of loyalty. Actually the acknowledgement of the Queen's supremacy was constantly limited by the definition given to that supremacy by the Puritans, as is evident in the declaration made by Cartwright and his fellow prisoners in a letter written to Burghley in 1591. They accepted an interpretation of the Royal Supremacy "no other, then the reformed churches have, in the dutifull acknowledgement of th' authority of their severall Magistrates, none other than her Majesties own admonicion in th'end of her injunctions, and the xxxviith article of the Convocation, and especially the most autentike and classicall writers of this Church."<sup>(12)</sup> Anyone skilled in the art of equivocation could find a dozen loopholes in such a definition when pressed upon any particular point. It amounted to a distinction between royal authority in Church and State; and at that time the Church was virtually a department of state in England. Plentiful evidence was forthcoming in Puritan pamphlets of the qualifications put upon the royal supremacy. They often

---

(x) Scott Pearson, p.471.

distinguished obedience of doing and obedience of suffering<sup>(13)</sup>; to those in authority the latter was sheer disobedience. The general opinion among Puritans usually left "things indifferent" to the discretion of the crown, though there were exceptions<sup>x</sup>. However it was clear that the boundary line of "things indifferent" was not to be drawn by the crown. Point was given to such declarations by the attitude of Puritan prisoners towards the oath "ex officio", "the generall and indefinite oath to answer to whatsoever ... should be demanded touching articles to be objected."<sup>§</sup> Cartwright when arrested in 1590 refused to take the oath as "contrarie boeth to the lawes of god and of the land."<sup>+</sup> At a subsequent examination he amplified this statement. He again refused to take the oath in the presence of the High Commission in May 1591, in spite of the persuasive words of "Mr Attorney", taking his stand upon the Law of God.<sup>(14)</sup> In other words the private interpretation of the Word of God was to take precedence of the official interpretation of what represented the will of the Sovereign. The Puritans consistently compared the laws of the land with the law of their own consciences, their own ideals, and made the latter the

---

(x) cf. "A parte etc." p.50.

(§) Scott Pearson, p.455.

(+) loc.cit.



supreme test<sup>(15)</sup>. Objectively, as has been shown, this became an appeal to their own interpretation of the Bible. However great the lip-service rendered to loyalty, the qualifications could not be overlooked<sup>(16)</sup>. Honour was rendered to the Church of England, but as much as possible was made of its blemishes<sup>(17)</sup>. The Church was put on a different footing from the state<sup>(18)</sup>, and the Queen as supreme governor of the Church of England was very definitely limited in her authority<sup>(19)</sup>. The more extreme declarations of the supreme authority of the Word of God directly challenged the supreme authority of the earthly head of the church, who was also in England head of the state. The Separatist cut the Gordian knot by refusing to recognize the national church: for the true Puritan this solution was impossible. From his point of view Church and State were connected and had to progress together. It was the accepted belief of the sixteenth century. The Puritans however emphasised the need for ecclesiastical reformation, and so made the church the leading member in the partnership. Church and state were like the twins of "Hypocrates'" story<sup>(20)</sup>, according to Cartwright, and "neyther is it to be hoped for / <sup>t</sup>y the common wealth shall flourishe / vntill the

church be reformed."<sup>κ</sup> Cartwright used a still more remarkable figure of speech when he compared the church to a house and the commonwealth to its hangings<sup>(21)</sup>. What he meant by this strange simile is open to discussion. To give it any meaning the 'Church' must be the Apostolic Church organized, according to Puritan theory, with divinely appointed perfection, and the "Commonwealth" either England, or the various states of Western Europe, which admittedly grew into being within the Christian era, after the promulgation of the perfect ecclesiastical order. But the vagueness and indefiniteness of the phraseology, and the obscurity of the interpretation, made the doctrine of "house and hangings" very dangerous in the eyes of authority. Whitgift harped upon the theme in his "Defence", and tried to prove the anarchical tendencies of Puritanism by reference to it in several other contexts. Probably all for which Cartwright was arguing was the subordination of the secular magistrate to the orders of the ecclesiastical officers in the particular field marked out by Puritans as the sphere of the Church. The Puritans were not disposed to separate state and church by so great a distance that the secular sword should not be available to supplement the spiritual weapon.

---

(κ) T.C. I, p.3.

The precedence given by Puritans to religious affairs made the constitutional theory of their ecclesiastical scheme important. They were not prepared to give the civil ruler full authority in the church; they were equally unready to appoint any one ecclesiastic to a position of supremacy. The great constitutional principle of Puritanism was the equality or "parity" of ministers<sup>(22)</sup>, a claim first prominent at Cambridge in 1569-70, but uttered in "A Confession of Fayth" printed in London in 1561.<sup>x</sup> No one person could rightly be sole ruler in any church<sup>(23)</sup>. Ecclesiastical matters were so vital that they ought to be considered by the whole community, either directly or through chosen representatives<sup>(24)</sup>. The Puritan Discipline was not however fully democratic. The position of greatest importance was held by the Consistory, the local unit of ecclesiastical government. It was "the company and assembly of the Elders of the Church, [which included the ministers] who by common counsell and authoritie, doe rule and governe the same."<sup>§</sup> The lay-elders were elected by the congregation from among their own number, and were not permanent members of the consistory:

---

(x) cf. Burrage "Dissenters", Vol. I, p.78.  
 (§) "Eccles. Disc." p.165.

the ministers sat "ex officio", but had also received the approbation of the community on accepting office. These "Elders" were to guide and direct the people in the administration of Church affairs: the Consistory was the executive department in all cases, but for the determination of important matters the people's assent was required<sup>(25)</sup>. Consistories were to be combined into Synods, and so a national body was to be formed which should possess supreme authority<sup>(26)</sup>. What was to happen in the case of a conflict of opinion was not clearly stated: the Puritans were unable to develop their practice sufficiently to have a keen realisation of the omission, but Presbyterian churches have been noted for their tendency to schisms, and it is probable that Puritanism would have suffered the same fate if allowed to flourish unchecked. As it was much of the separation of Elizabeth's reign was an offshoot from Puritanism, and probably the eagerness of Puritans to have the support of the secular arm was due to a recognition, perhaps subconscious, of the inherent difficulty in their projects.

It was clear that the Puritans scheme would give a large measure of power to the ministers of religion. The ministerial element was permanent in the consistorial or synodic organization, while the elected lay-elders, being



but temporary occupants of their places, would be less confident of themselves. Where the Word of God was of such importance, the words of those who had made it their special study would be of great weight. As Hooker pointed out of the Genevan example "when things came to trial of practice, their pastors' learning would be at all times of force to over-persuade simple men, who knowing the time of their own presidentship to be but short would always stand in fear of their ministers' perpetual authority"<sup>x</sup>. In spite of its democratic appearance, the actual working of the Presbyterian system tended to oligarchy - or aristocracy, if regarded from a different view point.

In any case the substance of sovereignty in a considerable sphere of the national life was to be vested in something resembling a close corporation, or if the democratic side was emphasised, which would be still worse in Elizabeth's opinion, in the hands of every common workman who thought he could read his Bible<sup>(27)</sup>.

Travers in fact claimed that his scheme of Church government was the best, because it was a 'mixed' government, thus anticipating eighteenth century laudations of the British constitution - but he made God the head, not the

---

(x) Hooker E.P. Pref. 11.4.

Queen<sup>(28)</sup>. Cartwright had made the same claim, and drawn a parallel between the Presbyterian Discipline and the English constitution which was remarkable in that Parliament was made the democratic element, while the Council was the equivalent of the consistory<sup>(29)</sup>.

The question of the ultimate seat of authority upon earth was never really discussed by the Puritan thinkers and theorists. They could not attempt it, for they looked to the Crown, and sought to work through it. There were Puritans who were more extreme, such as William White, John Nash, William Drewett,<sup>x</sup> and "Martin Marprelate", who would have disregarded national considerations, but they were in the line that led to Separatism. "Browne and Harrison could gather congregations of Brownists, for theirs was a people's movement, but Cartwright and Travers could not readily gather congregations of Cartwrightians, for their policy was first of all to prepare their scheme and receive constitutional sanction for its realisation."<sup>§</sup> Cartwright in the Star Chamber denied that he had "advocated the establishment of the discipline without permission of the civil magistrate."<sup>+</sup> None the less the more extreme

---

(x) "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, Docs. Nos. 60-62, pp.99-102, and Docs. Nos. 99, 100, pp.147-153.

(§) Scott Pearson, p.411.

(+) op.cit. p.333.

aroused the suspicions of the government and caused its intervention on occasion: on the other hand the extremists were probably right in their contention that the policy of compromise would not succeed in influencing Elizabeth or her bishops. For whenever the government took action and made investigations, it became apparent that the allegiance offered by all Puritans to the Queen as head of the Church of England was not as full as the allegiance offered to the Queen as civil ruler. They made a reservation which called in question part of the royal prerogative, which sought to impose conditions, unwarranted by any statute or customary usage, upon the exercise of ecclesiastical headship. They did not yield the full allegiance which the Queen expected and demanded, but dared to set themselves up as critics of the fabric of the Church of England, and to give practical expression in some form to their criticism. Of those who sought so to separate church and state by annexing indefeasibly a considerable field of crown prerogative to the church, to be exercised by ministers or elders, it might well be said with accuracy that they laboured "to erect a new popedome in everie parish."<sup>x</sup> If the Queen had heard of these opinions, as she almost certainly had, she might well

---

(x) "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p.233.

have spoken as Archbishop Sandys of York reported in 1587: "I will tell yow what the queenes majestie saide, that these puritanes were greater enimies to hir then the papists"<sup>x</sup>. For the Puritans were professedly loyal, and therefore traitors within the camp. They sought to create an imperium in imperio, and the classis movement proved their doctrine no mere theorizing.

The stand that individual Puritans made upon grounds of conscience proved indeed that the fundamental principle of Puritanism was democratic, however aristocratic or oligarchic Puritanism might appear in practice. The theory of contract propounded by Travers<sup>(30)</sup> as to the origin of government dealt only with government and administration, not legislation, and the implication at least was that "the people" would always have a say in the choice of governors: there was no permanent surrender of authority to an institution which afterwards was to keep itself alive. It was a mere incidental reference, but apparently the authority of the few or of the one chosen to govern would require renewal at each appointment of a new superior. The permanence of authority, ultimate sovereignty, seemed to lie with the many, to be in the hands of the governed, committed to the governors

---

(x) op.cit. Vol. II, p.224.



only as a temporary trust. It was this principle, never clearly formulated by the Puritans, and indeed concealed by their insistence on uniformity and the consistorial system, that lay behind their opposition to the crown: their individualism could not be compatible with true loyalty, as understood by Elizabeth. Hence their difficulties and inconsistencies.

The arguments used, prior to Hooker, by defenders of the Church of England against the Puritans did little to clarify the situation. They amounted in sum to a defence of the existing situation as right. The head of the civil state, the Prince, at that time in England Queen Elizabeth, was also head of the national church, God's vice-gerent in matters ecclesiastical as in matters secular. For convenience the two departments of the national life were organized separately, but no hard and fast line was to be drawn debarring members of one branch of organization from undertaking functions normally performed by members of the other branch. There were indeed spiritual duties, which no secular person could perform, but there were ecclesiastical duties to which the Queen could assign anyone she chose, either directly or by delegated authority. All centred on the Queen, and a wide sphere of administrative and interpretative duties was left to the

discretion of the crown. Kings ruled by divine right even in the church. There was a sentence in Bishop Jewel's "Apology" for the Church of England against the Roman Catholics which upheld this opinion. "Nos publice docemus ita obtemperandum esse principibus, tanquam hominibus a Deo missis; quique illis resistit, illum Dei ordinationi resistere."<sup>x</sup> Whitgift argued that monarchy was the best form of government for church as well as state. If a Christian ruler was head of the civil state he ought also to be head of the ecclesiastical organization,<sup>§</sup> "else how can you make the prince supreme governor of all states and causes ecclesiastical?"<sup>+</sup> "Christian princes have, and must have, the chief care and government of the church next under God."<sup>e</sup> The danger of tyranny involved in the rule of one was pointed out by Cartwright: Whitgift's reply<sup>(31)</sup> was interesting, in that it contained the germ of a thought developed by Hooker<sup>φ</sup>, that of the self-limitation of a supreme ruler, and in that it showed that the essence of the problem of sovereignty had not been grasped. Puritan pleas for the separation of "church" and "state", the differentiating clearly of

---

(x) Jewel "Apol.", p.23. Pars. IV, Cap. viii, Div. 3.

(§) cf. Whitgift II, pp.263, 264.

(+) op.cit. Vol. I, p.27, and cf. Vol. III, pp.181, 182, 198.

(e) op.cit. Vol. III, p.218.

(φ) cf. Hooker, E.P. I, ii.

civil and ecclesiastical authority, were put on one side, and a measure of commixture of the two declared to be right and lawful<sup>x</sup>.

That for which Whitgift argued was the actual policy of Elizabeth. She was head of the nation, whether it was viewed from the political or the ecclesiastical aspect, and it suited her convenience to use officials of either department, as required, for any task. Laymen and clergy sat together on the High Commission, for example. Such was the tradition of the English Reformation: no better precedent could be found for such a practice than the appointment by Henry VIII of Thomas Cromwell to be Vicar General of the church. By confusing the two spheres of government it strengthened the royal control over the ecclesiastical organization, that completeness of control the gaining of which for the crown was the peculiar feature of the Reformation in England.

The conclusion attained by Hooker was practically the same as Whitgift's, but it was reached by means of a carefully constructed argument which was a great advance on anything previously attempted in the controversy. His clarity of thought could not accept the obvious confusion and inconsistency of Puritan principles: he saw that their

---

(x) cf. Whitgift I, p.153 and III p.160.

profession of loyalty was incompatible with their scheme of ecclesiastical reform based on their interpretation of the word of God, and that in the conflict of principles it was loyalty to the crown that was subordinate.

The primary dispute was concerning Church government, and it was only the pressure of circumstances that brought other matters into the field of contention. To all his reasoning on Ecclesiastical Polity the definition of the "Church" given by Hooker is pertinent. He began by drawing a distinction, which the Puritans never made, between the Visible Church and the Mystical Church. The latter was included within the former, but fellowship in it depended on personal religion and right relation to God, and therefore was, for Hooker, impossible to be discerned by man<sup>(32)</sup>. Puritans desired to make the two, as far as life on earth was concerned, one body, by strict inquisition into opinions and belief, and to extend their ideal church till it should be co-extensive with the nation. But for Hooker, whenever any duty was laid on the Church "the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company"<sup>x</sup>, namely the Visible Church. It included all who professed "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."<sup>§</sup> So all

---

(x) Hooker E.P. III.1.3.

(§) op.cit. III.1.7, cf. V.lxviii.6.



Christian sects were included in the Church, and even heretics and men excommunicated, provided they had not apostatized and denied the name of Christ.<sup>x</sup> This definition included even Roman Catholics. However there was another way of speaking of the "Church". The Visible Church, though one, was subdivided. "A Church as now we are to understand it, is a Society; that is, a number of men belonging unto some Christian fellowship, the place and limits whereof are certain."<sup>§</sup> Each national or local Church was then a "public Christian Society"<sup>+</sup>, and each had therefore "correspondent general properties"<sup>e</sup>. "And of such properties common unto all societies Christian, it may not be denied that one of the very chiefest is Ecclesiastical Polity."<sup>φ</sup> As there were very few men in England who did not profess to be Christians, this meant that membership of the Church, as far as government was concerned, was identical with membership of the commonwealth. It was a statement of nationalism on the ecclesiastical side. The Church was but the nation viewed from a different angle. It was rightly in power till dispossessed

by unanimous consent. So Hooker could also say that

- 
- (x) cf. op.cit. III.1.7, 8. "constraining force". There  
 (§) op.cit. III.1.14.  
 (+) loc.cit.encies in his theory: one started from the  
 (e) loc.cit.  
 (φ) loc.cit.tract and consent and led to Locke; the other

---

(x) Hooker E.P. IX.7, 8.

As the Church was a "public society" it came under the general rules applicable to all such societies. Hooker assumed that authority over bodies of men could never have come into being, unless God had given it, or men consented to it<sup>(33)</sup>. He thought that men, finding fulness of life impossible except in communities, had come together, and that they had then agreed, explicitly or implicitly, upon some form of government or administration to secure the "peace, tranquillity, and happy estate of themselves."<sup>(34)</sup> Government was essential for such societies, and for government some law other than the "Law of Reason" or "of Nature"<sup>(35)</sup>. These further laws, imposed by a government thus established, were indeed available by general consent, but that consent might have been given in the remote past, for the contract that established rule was permanent, unless at any time revoked by universal agreement<sup>(36)</sup>. The power which gave laws their force was indeed either of God or of the community, but it was exercised by the established government, which was rightly in power till dispossessed by unanimous consent. So Hooker could also say that "Laws have in them a certain constraining force"<sup>x</sup>. There were two tendencies in his theory: one started from the ideas of contract and consent and led to Locke; the other

---

(x) Hooker E.P. I.x.7,8.

developed the thought of permanence and compulsion and was ancestor to Hobbes.

The development and application of these two principles Hooker reserved for the last two books of his great work. Although these were ready for the press at the time of his death some mischance befel them, and it is uncertain whether what is in them as they now exist represents accurately Hooker's views, and there are gaps which are not filled. The Seventh Book is a defence of the Episcopal order, its authority, both secular and ecclesiastical, its ranks and privileges, by an appeal to tradition, church authority, and the principle of enduring contract. The Eighth Book would be most interesting if it were complete and perfect, for it is a defence of the "supreme regency" and "power of ecclesiastical dominion" of the "civil prince or governor" of England.<sup>x</sup> The Church and the Commonwealth of England were but one society regarded from two aspects.<sup>§</sup> Monarchy was the best form of government.<sup>†</sup> Applying the theory of contract and consent, the royal supremacy in religious affairs was found lawful,<sup>e</sup> being derived partly from ancient consent handed down in custom,<sup>φ</sup> partly from the former papal power transferred

- 
- (x) op.cit. VIII. Title.
  - (§) op.cit. VIII.1.2.
  - (+) op.cit. VIII.11.18.
  - (e) op.cit. VIII.11.16.
  - (φ) op.cit. VIII.vi.

to the crown with the consent of the nation given in Parliament<sup>x</sup>. This power was divinely sanctioned, for "unto kings by human right, honour by very divine right, is due"<sup>§</sup>. Sovereign dominion was transmitted by hereditary right<sup>+</sup> once the original contract had granted it to the first of a dynasty<sup>e</sup>. If his views are accurately presented Hooker would have trusted to the Prince's character and law-abiding sense for his due observance of his limits. For he exempted the supreme ruler from any earthly judgment or sanction<sup>φ</sup>. That is, practically, the Prince was to be his own arbiter of the extent to which he was bound by the laws of Nature, supernatural laws, and the limits imposed in the original contract, which were proclaimed at the coronation ceremony<sup>‡</sup>. Probably this position was forced on Hooker, if he was to avoid the Puritan contention that supreme power resided with the ecclesiastical representatives of God and his people. It was however a conclusion congenial to his modest and reverential disposition. Only the "universal assent"<sup>q</sup> of the people could revoke that imagined original contract which established government, and so only

- 
- (x) op.cit. VIII.viii.4.  
 (§) op.cit. VIII.ii.6.  
 (+) op.cit. VIII.ii.8.  
 (e) op.cit. VIII.ii.9, 10.  
 (φ) op.cit. VIII.ix.2, 3.  
 (‡) Hooker E.P. VIII.ii.13.  
 (q) op.cit. I.x.8.



"universal consent"<sup>π</sup> could justify such a fundamental change as the Puritans desired. Law for Hooker demanded, except in the case of the "first eternal law",<sup>§</sup> an authority, a superior, who should administer the laws:<sup>+</sup> it required a sanction, and his orderly mind sought a supreme earthly sanction, which he found in the Prince in Parliament,<sup>θ</sup> and ultimately, presumably, in the Prince who was subject to no authority save that of God<sup>φ</sup>. Still, that is only an inference: in his work he laid down very plainly that the supremacy of the chief ruler was not unlimited,<sup>⓪</sup> and the possibility of a conflict between ruler and limitations was not suggested. Whether in the final draft of his concluding book he did attempt to reconcile the possible conflict of fundamental laws with supreme authority we cannot tell. He might have anticipated Locke more fully: as it is he is parent to Hobbes' also. The root of the problem as to the seat of authority lay in a confusion of meaning concerning the word "lawful". "It is grown a question, whether power ecclesiastical over the Church, power of dominion in such degree as the laws of this land do grant unto the sovereign governor thereof,

---

(π) op.cit. VIII.ii.10.

(§) op.cit. I.ii.2.

(+) op.cit. I.x.7.

(θ) op.cit. VIII.ii.17.

(φ) op.cit. VIII.ix.2.

(⓪) op.cit. VIII.ii.3, 11, 13, 17.

may by the said supreme Head and Governor lawfully be enjoyed and held."<sup>x</sup> Was legal right to be considered as also ethical right? Hooker's answer as it stands can be made to yield an affirmative reply: the Puritan negative was a valuable protest against the doctrine that the State is the supreme value in human life.

However in dealing with Hooker the circumstances of the time must always be remembered. In Elizabethan England it was difficult to theorize on questions of sovereignty. The Queen had no intention of surrendering any of her cherished ecclesiastical prerogative: she knew no law but her own good sense, and her intuition for and anticipation of popular opinion prevented the question from passing beyond the doctrinaire stage. It was safe to be absolutist under Elizabeth; the more so since both Catholic and extreme Protestant writers, such as Mariana and George Buchanan, had advocated tyrannicide as a solution of any crucial dispute over sovereignty, and since Catholics did not hesitate to plot to put their theory into practice at the expense of the Queen. To Elizabeth her ecclesiastical authority was essential: the bishops were not rivals but servants. Those who assailed her prerogative were disloyal. And as both sides

---

(x) op.cit. VIII.11.1.

admittedly considered religion a right and proper interest of state, she had much justification for her attitude. As George Cranmer wrote to Hooker, "They [Puritans] do not see that for the most part when they strike at the state ecclesiastical, they secretly wound the civil state"<sup>(x)</sup>. The Church of England was one of the props of the throne. In the circumstances of the time lies the justification of Hooker's attitude: in the events of the future appeared the real value of the Puritan protest.

---

(x) Bayne "Book Five", p.588.

NOTES TO "THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY"

---

1. "If yt (Church of England) were meerly and absolutely Antichristian I see not how yt could be avoyded but that we must with ye Brownistes confesse that we have noe church at all in ye land." [Cartwright]. (Scott Pearson p. 310).

"I graunt the corruptions off the church of England to be suche / that man in absteininge from the pollutions ther off / owght not so seuer him selfe from those open assemblies / wherein the eternall worde off the Lorde God is preached and the Sacramentes administred / althoughe not in that puritie which they owght to be." [Cartwright]. (T.C. II. p. xxxviii).

"No man ought to separate him selfe from the Church which God hath given vs in this lande." [Dering]. ("A parte etc." p. 75).

"We hold the Church [of England] for a true Church of Christ, from which no member may separate himselfe although he must disallow the wants in her." [Fenner ?]. (op. cit. p. 509).



should "Wee make no separation from the Church of England, acknowledging it, notwithstanding the manifold deformities wherewith it is spotted ... to be the church of God." [Field and Wilcox]. (op. cit. p. 529).

"We dreame not of any unspotted church upon the Earth, and therefore... we thinke it not meete for private persons of their own auctoritie, without learninge or knowledge to establishe churches." [Field and Wilcox]. ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p. 86).

"In that you dissent from the universall Church of Christ, you are a Schismatique." [White to an Anabaptist]. (op. cit. Vol. I, p. 105).<sup>✱</sup>

2. "I thinke not, that congregations may be forsaken for garments and cappes, or some suchelike mere indifferent and mene thing.... They are in greate fault before God and his Angels, which had rather abide to have flockes deprived of pastors, and foundations laide of moste horrible confusion by the pastors forsaking of theyr congregations, then to see ministers otherwise without fault, to use rather thys then that apparell: and that in some places there shoulde rather be no supper given to the hungrie sheepe, then that kneling

---

(✱) Cf. "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, pp. 146, 224, etc.

5. should be omitted." [Beza]. ("Ad. Parlt." fol D ii verso, iii recto, iii verso).<sup>⌘</sup>

3. "If some of those whych fauor this cause / haue ben ouercaryed in part / to do things which might haue ben more cōueniently ordered / it is against reason that you should therfore charge those / which fauor thys cause that you oppugne.... If those metings / whych they had / were permitted vnto them / by them / that haue authoritie / I see nothing / why they may not seeke to serue God in puritie / and les mixture of hurtfull ceremonies." (T.C.I. p. 15).

"I saye againe / that the name off conuenticles is to light and contēptuous for those meetīges....." (T.C. II. p. xxxviii).

[The doctrines of the "conventiclors" are set forth in "2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, Doc. Nos. 32-3, pp. 55-59].

4. "Quinque jam annos peregre a patria agens, eos prope omnes in ecclesiae Anglicanae, quae in transmarinis partibus haeret, ministerio consumsi." (Scott Pearson, p. 441).

"Ministerii mei transmarini honestam inter omnes existimationem." (op. cit. p. 443).

---

(⌘) Cf. also Bullinger in Zurich Letters, I. pp. 342, 349, 353, 361.

5. "My trouble .... is not only the restraynte of my libertie, these sixe yeares, butt especially, as that which lyeth muche heavier uppon me, the suspition of Disloyaltie, wherof I stande accused, to her ma<sup>tie</sup>.".... (Scott Pearson p. 439). "So shall I be suer to be eased of the slanderous surmyse of my disloyaltie to her ma<sup>ties</sup> estate, and to the common wealthe." [The whole letter is illuminating]. (op. cit. p. 440).<sup>x</sup>
6. "O England (to whom being bound both by common duetie of a citizen, and by publike ministry which sometimes I executed, I confesse that I owe all kind of great and speciall duetie.)" ("Eccles. Disc." Introd. p. ii).
7. "In our moest secret meetinges and consultations which we never thought we should have comen to th' examination of, we have caried ourselves with all dewtiful regard, not onely to her excellent maiestie, but also to the lawes of the land." (Scott Pearson p. 466).
8. "As for the magistrate / and authority / we acknowledge y<sup>e</sup> lawfulness / necessity / and singular commodity of it / we commēd it in our sermons to others / we pray for them / as for those / of whose good or euill

---

(x) Cf. further letters of Cartwright's in Scott Pearson, pp. 451-454.



estate / hangeth the flourishing or decay of the common  
wealth / and church both. We loue them as our fathers  
and mothers / we feare them / as our Lords and maisters /  
and we obey thẽ in the Lord / and for the Lord". [Cart-  
wright]. (T.C.I. 13).

9. "Those [i.e. bishops] which call them rebels and  
seditions / [i.e. Admonitioners] which are faithfull  
subiects to God and their Prince ..... They will saye  
we despise authoritie / and speake againste her  
soveraignetie.... No / no / we heartely / plainly and  
faythfully professe / that the chefe governors in civill  
matters / have chefe authoritie over all persons / in  
their dominions and countreys / and are the fosterfathers /  
and nurses of christes church." ("Second Adm." Pref.  
fol. iv recto.)

Of the Admonitioners "if in any parte therof they  
shew suche contemptuous disobedience towards our  
soveraigne as some seeke to enforce / none shall thynke  
them more worthy punishment then I." ("Exhort" fol. A  
i verso et ii recto).

"Nowe whereas....the Q.... is hereuppon incensed that  
wee will be obedient to no lawes, that wee would be Lords  
and Kings ourselves, that wee would pull the Crowne from  
her heade, and swoorde out of her hand, that wee would  
erect a newe popedome: To putt her Ma<sup>tie</sup> out of doute



11. of the untruthe of theis, and to testifie of our true  
loyaltie....., we take the Lord God... to record unto  
our consciences that we acknowledge from the bottome of  
our harts Her Highnes to be our lawfull Queene, placed  
by God over us for our good and wealth. Wee give God  
most humble and hartie thanks for her happie government  
over us. Wee praise in our publique sermons weeklie and  
in our private prayers dailie for this prosperous govern-  
ment of her Maties over us. Wee renounce all forreyne  
government and acknowledge her Ma<sup>ts</sup> Title of Supremacie  
to be lawfull and just. Unto this Her Highnes lawfull  
government, wee acknowledge ourselves, bodies, goods,  
lands, and life, in all obedience to be subject." [Six  
Norwich Ministers]. (2nd Part Reg. Vol. I, p. 144).

10. "How were that to be suffered in the civill lawes  
of earthly princes / that some one of the commen sorte /  
or els other / should go about to disanul the order and  
law set out by the Prynce / Gods lieutenaunt in earth in  
those cases / to place his owne device ?" ("Exhort."  
fol. B 1 verso.)

"What doeth more belong unto the name, office, and  
duetie of a King, than to give Lawes unto his citizens  
and subjectes, and to make such decrees and ordinances  
whereby all the parts of his kingdome maie be maintained."  
[Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." p. 9).

11. "Wee beleeeue that it is the good will and pleasure of God to haue the worlde gouerned by lawes and pollicies, the executors whereof, hee hath appointed Kings, Rulers, Magistrates, etc. whom as hee hath made chiefe ouer others, so in his worde hee hath charged them, to provide for the publike peace and tranquillitie of the people, to defend the good, and to punishe the evill according to the notoriousness of the offence, but chiefly to haue a care of religion, and the seruice of God, and to prouide that the Church of God may be builded vp in all their Countries and Kingdomes, according to the will of God reuealed in his worde: wee holde that Christians may beare office, may wage battaile, and require a lawfull othe of their subiectes. Wee confesse that both vnto these Rulers, and also vnto others that are sent from them, euerie soule ought to be subject in the Lorde and for the Lorde, that to them doth appertaine taxes, toles, tributes, and such other kinds of paiementes, that their subiectes shoulde beare weapons, and goe to warre in their cause and quarrel: that they ought to pray for them earnestly, that they ought to loue them tenderly, and honour them as fathers, that they ought to giue them their titles, which the Lorde hath giuen them with all outwarde and inwarde reuerence to submitte themselves vnto them, and to serue them with goods, liues, and all

that they haue in bodily service: yea, all these, and whatsoever other duties the wordes of God doeth require, must bee done vnto them, though they bee infidels and wicked persons." ("A parte etc." pp. 543, 544.)

12. "Though the Queene haue Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, yet it is not absolute to do what she list: but with all humble submission I acknowledge all such iurisdiction as shee claimeth, for her owne wordes declare she claimeth no further iurisdiction then the worde of God doth allowe." [Gawton]. (op. cit. p. 396).
13. "We must make a distinction of obedience: There is obedience in doing, and there is obedience in suffering. The obedience in doing is, when we doe performe in deede that thing that is commaunded. And this obedience is absolutely, and without exception, due vnto God and not vnto men: albeit in respect it is due vnto men also, that is, so long as they commaunde the same things that God doeth." If rulers command things in opposition to God's will, then the penalties they inflict must be borne, which is the obedience of suffering. (op. cit. p. 50).
14. "He had laid the cheif strenght of his refusall upon the law of god: secondly upon the lawes of the land, which in some men's judgement professing the skill of the lawes, [e.g. Morrice, op. cit. p. 328] did not warrant



17. such proceeding. But seeing that he heard Mr Attorney affirm as he did, and that he had no eyes to look into the depths and mysteries of the law: that he would most principally relie and stand (at this praesent) upon the law of god." (Scott Pearson. p. 459).

15. "Conscience toward God, which causeth us rather to desire to be guiltles, then to have libertie..... If we had transgressed some of the lawes of the land, wherof our consciences set in the praesence of god doe not accuse us....." (op. cit. p. 478).

16. "If there be any thyng / wherin we do not according to that which is commaunded / it is / because we can not be persuaded in our consciences / that we may so doe (wherof we are ready to render a reason out of the word of God) and if that wil not serue / forthwith to submit our selues / to that punishment / that shall be awarded against vs." [Cartwright]. (T.C.I. p. 13).

"We speake not against ciuill gouernment / nor yet against ecclesiastical / further than the same is an enemy to the gouernment / that God hath instituted." [Cartwright]. (op. cit. I. p. 17).

"Great blame worthy are they that... seeke to aggravate the matter / in charging them with disobedience to hir Maiestie / as thougheto honor the almightie / were to dishonor the Prince." ("Exhort." fol. A ii recto).<sup>x</sup>

(x) Cf. Also Ad. Parlt. fol. A vii recto.



17. "We praise God for this reformation / so farre  
forthe / as it is agreeable vnto the word of God."  
[Cartwright]. (Cf. Mult. Al.). (T.C.I. p. 15).
18. "Princes haue full authoritie ouer all ecclesiasti-  
call and ciuill persons, and equallie ouer both....  
Onely this is the difference in the soveraigntie ouer  
both. First the common wealth can not be without the  
Magistrate.... but.... Christ, & not the christian  
Magistrate, is the life and head of it [the Church].  
Agayne, in the common wealth the Prince makethor re-  
pealeth lawes..... But in the church there is no lawe  
giuer but Christe..... For God hath made the King,  
though hee were as great as an Angell, yet a seruant in  
his Church." [Dering]. ("A parte etc." p. 79).
19. "For as much as Christ is the onely lawgiuer in his  
Church, and the onely ordainer of officers therein: if  
any King or Prince in the worlde ordeine or allowe other  
officers in the Church, then Christ hath alreadie or-  
dained and allowed, wee will rather lay downe our neckes  
on the blocke, then consent thereto." [Harvey].  
("A parte etc." p. 367).
20. "How may any prince geve one man authoritie to be  
byshop over a province or a diocese?" ("Articles"  
fol. B iii recto).

"As an inferioure Magistrate may not take the authoritie of the hyghest into hys handes / no more may any Magistrate usurpe Gods." ("Second Adm." p. 9).

"It is flatterie to suffer princes to doe what they liste." [Udall]. ("Dem. Disc." p. 66).

20. "And undoubtedly / seeing that the church / and common wealth / do embrace / and kisse one an other / and seeing / they be like vnto Hypocrates twinnes / whych were sicke together / and well together / laughed together / and weeped together / and alwayes like affected: it can not be / but that the breaches of the common wealth / haue proceeded from the hurtes of the church / and the wants of the one / from the lackes of the other." (T.C.I. pp. 2, 3).

Perhaps "the addition written by a godlie minded man" to "The lamentable Complaint of the Commonaltie", with its interesting paragraph on the economic woes of the "yomanrie", was written to strengthen the case for further reformation in accordance with Cartwright's dictum. ("A parte etc." p. 278.)

21. "And heere commeth to my minde / [in a discussion of elders] that wherwyth the world is now deceyued / and wherwyth M. doctor goeth about bothe to deceiue him selfe and others to / in that he thinketh that the church must



23. "Although it be graunted that the gouernment of one / be the best in the common wealth / yet it can not be in the church. For the Prince may wel be Monarche immediately betwene God and the common wealth / but no man can be monarche betwene God and hys church but Christ." [Cartwright]. (T.C.I. p. 182).

"Yt followeth not / because ciuill matters whiche touche the commoditie off this liffe / maie be committed to one: therefore ecclesiasticall also / which concerne the liffe to come / maie be so hazarded..... It is sufficient that the prouerbe off moo eies seinge better then one, be trewe for the moste parte." [Cartwright]. (op. cit. II, p. cxxx).

Of choosing ministers "almost all [learned men] consent in this, that there must be moe to deal therein, and that so great and so weightie a charge, and belonging to the especial and singular commoditie or discommodity of the whole Church, ought not to be committed to the authoritie of anie one, but be ordered and ruled by the judgement and consent of manie." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Dioc." p. 44).

24. In church government the ministers were to be joined by "assistants" "whome the parish shall consent upon and chuse / for their good iudgement in religion and godliness." In great matters the whole congregation was to be consulted. (p. 46). ("Second Adm." p. 45).



"By what right.... may.... the Bishoppes wythoutethe iudgement and consent of theyr Eldership, of duetie ordaine anything. I have not yet learned." [Beza]. ("Ad. Parlt." fol. D. iv recto).

25. In the election of ministers "I thinke it most agreeing with the will of God, that, that Senate and counsell which exerciseth ordinarie authoritie in all the affaires of the Church.... should also have most a do in this businesse, to governe the Election, and to guide and direct the judgement of the rest of the Church with their wisdoms and authoritie. Neither do I bringe in heere any Oligarchy or tyrannous rule of a few, and reteine still the same tyrannie in the Church, chaunging onely the persons: For I would not that the judgement of the rest of the Church should be contemned and neglected, or that the counsell or Elders of the Church should of their owne authoritie set one over the Church whom they list, against the Churches will; but that the Elders going before, the people also follow, and having heard and understoode their sentence and decree, may either by some outward token, or else by their silence allow it, if it be to be liked of, or gainesay it, if it be not just and upright: and not onely gainesay it, but if just cause of their disliking may be brought, make it altogether void and of none effect, until at the last a meete one may be chosen by the

authoritie and voyces of the Elders, and allowed of by the consent and approbation of the rest of the Church: so that heerein there is no cause to complaine, that by the bringing in of the rule of a few, the maiestie of the whole Church is diminished." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." pp. 52, 53).

"Therefore keeping the right libertie of the Church, I conclude out of the word of God, and the examples of the Apostles, That nothing be done, not onely against the good will thereof, [of the people] or unknowing to the same, but also not without the consent and approbation of it. But we must keepe also the iust authority of the Elders, that they go before the people in the election: that they trie and examine those that are to be chosen, that they iudge of their worthinesse, and publish unto the Church, whom they have thought meete and worthy: that being allowed of the consent of al, they may be received." [Travers]. (op. cit. p. 55).

26. "I call that a Synode provincially / whych is the meeting of certaine of the consistorie of every parishe wythin a province / which is of manye conferences..... where great causes of the churches / whych could not be ended in their owne consistories / or conferences / shall be heard and determined / and so they shall stande / except when a more generall Synode / and counsell of the

whole land be / whych I call nationall / and they will have it hearde there / to whose determination they shall stande / excepte there be a more general Synode of all churches.... And otherwyse then thus / let no oneminister use / or challenge any authoritie out of hys owne charge." ("Second Adm." pp. 30, 31). Cf. also the Puritan "Classes" organisation.

27. "The dignitie also / and hygh estate of those / whych are not so earnest in thys cause / can not hinder it / if we consider / the wisdome of God / almost from time to time / to consist / and to shew it selfe most in setting forth his truth / by the simpler / and weaker sort....." ..... "And I humbly craue / and most earnestly desire of those / whych beare the cheefe titles in the Ecclesiasticall functions / that as we doe in parte correct our negligence / by the example of the forwardnes / and readines of the people: so they would suffer themselves / to be put in remembrance of their dueties / by vs / which are vnderneath them / and..... that they would first consider.... they may receiue oftentimes profitable advertisement / by those / whych are in lower places then they them selues be..... It cannot deminishe their true honoure / nor empaire the credite of their godly and vncounterfaite wisdome / if they geue care vnto that / which is spoken by their inferiours." [Cartwright]. (T.C.I. pp. 4, 5).



28. "It is the best state of all, whereas al these three [where one is soveraigne, or more, or all (p. 184)] meete in one kinde of gouvernement (as both Plato thought, and Aristotle, and the other chiefe and excellent Philosophers) that state I saie, wherein all the citizens obediently submit them selves to God (which commandeth as king and monarch) and the assembly, which decreeth by his will and authoritie: where also the assembly decreeth no weightie matter without the consent and approbation of the rest of the Church and people." ("Eccles. Disc." p. 185).
29. "The churche is gouerned wyth that kinde of gouernment / whych the Philosophers / that wryte of the best common wealthes / affirme to be the best. For in respectes of Christe the heade / it is a Monarchie / and in respectes of the auncientes and pastoures / that gouerne in common / and wyth like authoritie amongste them selues / it is an Aristocratie / ..... and in respectes that the people are not secluded / but haue their interest in churche matters / it is a Democratie..... An image whereof appeareth also in the pollicye of thys Realme / for as in respectes of the Queene her maiestie / it is a Monarchie / so in respectes of the moste honourable Counsell / it is an Aristocratie / and hauing regard to the Parliament / whych is assembled of al estates / it is a Democratie." (T.C.I. p. 51).



30. "As in common wealthes, not onely such, where the people is to be made soveraigne, or a few, but also even where the kingdom of one is to be established, before it be confirmed, all the power is in the peoples hands, who, of their free will, choose magistrates unto them, under whose authoritie they may after be governed: and after-wardes, not all the people, but onely the magistrates chosen by them, administer and governe the affaires of the common wealth. So it commeth to passe in establishing of the Church." (Eccles. Disc. pp. 53, 54).
31. "This is as though you should say that, if a monarchy be an excellent kind of government, and indeed the best, when the laws rule and not man (as Aristotle saith), then also is it the worst when affection ruleth and not the law, which is true; for that is the worst state of government which is opposed to the best. But if you will therefore conclude that a monarchy is not the best state, your argument hath no reason in it: even so is it in the government of the church, if the chief governor thereof should follow his own appetite and be ruled by his private affections; but it is far otherwise when he ruleth according to the laws whereunto he himself is subject." (Whitgift. Vol. II, p. 244).

32. "That Church of Christ, which we properly term his body mystical, can be but one; neither can that one be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth (albeit their natural persons be visible) we do not discern under this property, whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body." (Hooker E.P. III. 1.2).
33. "Over a whole grand multitude having no.... dependency upon any one, and consisting of so many families as every politic society in the world doth, impossible it is that any should have complete lawful power, but by consent of men, or immediate appointment of God." (op. cit. I.x.4).
34. "Forasmuch as we are not by ourselves sufficient to furnish ourselves with competent store of things needful for such a life as our nature doth desire, a life fit for the dignity of man; therefore to supply those defects and imperfections which are in us living single and solely by ourselves, we are naturally induced to seek communion and fellowship with others. This was the cause of men's uniting themselves at the first in politic Societies..... Two foundations there are which bear up public societies; the one, a natural inclination, whereby all men desire

sociable life and fellowship; the other, an order expressly or secretly agreed upon touching the manner of their union in living together. The latter is that which we call the Law of a Commonweal." (Hooker, E.P. I.x.1).

"To take away all..... mutual grievances, injuries, and wrongs, there was no way but only by growing unto composition and agreement amongst themselves, by ordaining some kind of government public, and by yielding themselves subject thereunto; that unto whom they granted authority to rule and govern, by them the peace, tranquillity, and happy estate of the rest might be procured..... The assent of them who are to be governed seemeth necessary." (op. cit. I.x.4).

"All public regiment of what kind soever seemeth evidently to have arisen from deliberate advice, consultation, and composition between men, judging it convenient and behoveful." (loc. cit.)

35. "Politie societies could not be without Government, nor Government without a distinct kind of Law [from the Law of Nature]". (op. cit. I.x.1).

"The corruption of our nature being presupposed, we may not deny but that the Law of Nature doth now require of necessity some kind of regiment." (op. cit. I.x.4).

36. "By the natural law, whereunto God hath made all subject, the lawful power of making laws to command whole politic societies of men belongeth so properly unto the same entire societies, that for any prince or potentate of what kind soever upon earth to exercise the same of himself, and not either by express commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by authority derived at the first from their consent upon whose persons they impose laws, it is no better than mere tyranny.

Laws they are not therefore which public approbation hath not made so. But approbation not only they give who personally declare their assent by voice sign or act, but also when others do it in their names by right originally at the least derived from them.

To be commanded we do consent, when that society whereof we are part hath at any time before consented, without revoking the same after by the like universal agreement..... We were then alive in our predecessors, and they in their successors do live still. Laws therefore human, of what kind soever, are available by consent." (Hooker E.P. I.x.8).



### THE ULTIMATE ISSUE.

The ultimate factor in the Puritan controversy was really theological. This fact was never clearly brought to light in the reign of Elizabeth, though Hooker's work reveals it. For the most part doctrinal questions were not matters of dispute. Such of the Thirty Nine Articles as bore on them were accepted alike by Puritan and Anglican. As resolute an opponent of Puritanism as Whitgift could derive his theological tenets from Calvin. Both sides assumed that they were at one as far as their Christian faith was concerned, however much they might disagree as to the form in which it should be expressed in the world. Not till the First Book of the "Ecclesiastical Polity" was published did it appear that the differences were fundamental because the rival parties looked on the supreme things of life from different standpoints. These differences were vitally important, because religion and politics were interconnected, but the secondary manifestations had completely obscured the deeper implications. In any case it is difficult to determine whether theological presuppositions influenced political views, or the exigencies of politics necessitated the

adoption of a particular theological position. Probably neither alternative states the whole truth. Men came to meet their problems with vague preferences or ideas, with a certain bias in their modes of thought, and the grindstone of fact sharpened and defined more pointedly their conceptions.

The best approach to this vital question lies along the line of the use made of Scripture by the controversialists<sup>(1)</sup>. There was a measure of agreement in this matter. Every Protestant who took religion seriously believed in the complete verbal inspiration of the Bible. If a text could be found clearly and definitely stating a fact, any problem on which that fact had a bearing could be regarded as so far solved<sup>(2)</sup>.

The Puritans based their schemes and efforts on the Word of God. In defence of their principle there was another passage in the "Apology" of Bishop Jewel to which they could appeal. "Extant hodie sacrae literae, extant scripta apostolorum et prophetarum, ex quibus et omnis veritas et doctrina catholica probari possit, et omnis haeresis refutari."<sup>§</sup> They argued against the Church

---

(\*) Cf. Hooker E.P. I. xiii.2.

(§) Jewel "Apol." p. 9. Pars I. Cap. viii. Div. 1.

of England from exactly the same ground which its apologist had adopted against the Church of Rome. They declared that the Scriptures were the only means by which the will of God could be known, the only star for the direction of life<sup>(3)</sup>. The Bible was the standard to which the Puritans constantly appealed in writing and in argument<sup>(4)</sup>. The fact of the breach with the Papacy seemed to testify to its absolute validity. Reformations in several countries had been carried through, apparently by an appeal to the authority of Scripture against the authority of Rome. The Bible had been elevated by Luther and Calvin to a position of supremacy, and though Elizabeth was less explicit she too had acknowledged its authority. "According to the Scriptures" was a common Protestant tag. The Scriptures were indeed inspired: they were the word of God, to whose voice all Christendom listened, whom all Christian rulers sought to obey.

The peculiar feature of the Puritan use of Scripture depended on their theory of inspiration. Travers expounded the doctrine in the course of a conference at Lambeth between representatives of Anglicans and Puritans. "Such an inspiration as did so whollie carie..... and governe the holie men of God so inspired, as that in reporting and setting downe these holie writings thei were exempted from all possibilitie of error."<sup>¶</sup> The

---

(¶) "2nd Part. Reg." Vol. I. p. 277.



possibilities of error thus excluded were extended by the Puritans to cover errors of omission in ecclesiastical matters<sup>(5)</sup>. Scripture was moreover an authority in all parts of life<sup>(6)</sup>. It was superior to the Church, to Law, to men's powers<sup>(7)</sup>. With particular reference to church government, as Scripture was the only expression of God's will for men, and was the perfect expression of that will, there must be a constitution set forth in its pages which all Christians ought to adopt. God had provided the Jews with detailed codes of laws, even with instructions for erecting their places of worship, through his servants Moses, Ezekiel, and others: could he possibly have neglected to do as much for his own people in the church through Christ ?<sup>x</sup> The Puritan discipline was then identified with this divinely ordained code<sup>(8)</sup>. It was given and prescribed by God<sup>(9)</sup>. The Puritans could even claim to be God's special messengers<sup>(10)</sup>, though some admitted that they might not perfectly have read his will<sup>(11)</sup>.

This it was which made Puritan declarations so offensive to those in authority. The Queen might strike medals after the defeat of the Spanish Armada giving the glory to God: all men admitted that God was the source of safety: but Puritan assertions of the sovereignty of God

---

(x) Cf. "Eccles. Disc." pp. 6-8.



always bore the corollary that they themselves were interpreters of God's will. Christ was King of Kings, but who were to represent Him on earth? The Puritan answer was in effect "We to whom He has revealed His will."

The Puritan conceptions of God, man, and the world, lay behind all their reasoning, though never set forth clearly. They adopted the Calvinistic view of God. He was a being transcendent, inscrutable, omniscient, almighty. Nothing was too great for His power, nothing too insignificant for His consideration. Every part of human life, every detail of thought and action, lay open to His gaze. All that a man was he owed to God's appointment. Powers and privileges were but trusts from God. His will directed all things: He was constantly at work in the world, rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked, but none could question His will. He was an absolute autocrat, whose purposes were hidden from all men except those to whom He chose to reveal them. The world was but the stage whereupon man's fate, his future weal or woe, was to be decided. Of itself it was evil: there was nothing of God in it as it was. Man himself could know nothing right apart from God. Human nature was perverse, foolish, doomed to destruction: human reason was blind, weak, ignorant. Only the grace of God could save a man from destruction, and lift him to that fellowship with

Himself which was predestined to be the lot of His elect. Only light given from God could illumine human understanding to read the lessons set forth in Scripture. Man as man was separated from the deity by a great gulf which God alone could bridge. Men stood on one side as individuals over against God on the other. God dealt with each man on his merits: the fate of the individual soul was a matter between the individual and God. Roman Catholicism was detestable because it had severed the connection of each individual with God, and removed the deity from earthly gaze by interposing a number of men's inventions in ecclesiastical organisation, and in the rites, ceremonies, and adjuncts of public worship. It claimed to bridge the gulf with a man-made bridge, whereas man's only hope was to cast himself upon the mercy of God. The aim of the Puritan was to bring each individual soul face to face with its Maker, and inclusion in the Church depended primarily on a man's private beliefs<sup>(12)</sup>, not on outward professions of faith nor on administration of sacraments.

Thus it was that Puritanism was individualistic, and, in its tendencies at least, democratic. When God was considered man was made insignificant, and before His might and majesty all were looked on as equals. No human distinction could compare with the great distinction

between man and God: in religious affairs human authority counted for nothing if it had no divine sanction. Men as men were all equally insignificant. Rank and prestige faded into obscurity at the presence of the glory of God. On the other hand, once a man had heard and obeyed the voice of God the authority of God was in some measure delegated to him. He became the channel of eternal truth. Divine inspiration was the true condition of leadership and authority in matters of religion, not succession hereditary or legal, not contracts based on human rights. Against God man had no rights, but with God on his side man needed no other right. God might permit human beings to exercise rule over their fellows, but whenever He made His will known it was their duty to bow before it<sup>(13)</sup>. Mere civil rulers were not to be obeyed when they gave orders contrary to God's command. That was part of the teaching of the man who for the Puritans stood next to the divine - Calvin. "The Church is the elect people of God, and must, if it is to do His work in the world, obey Him. But it can obey only as it has control over its own members. It will not err in matters of opinion if it is guided by the Holy Spirit and judges according to the Scriptures. Magistrates are ordained of God, and ought to be obeyed, even though wicked; but here a most significant exception is introduced. God is King of Kings; when He



opens His mouth, He alone is to be heard; it were worse than foolish to seek to please men by offending Him. We are subject to our rulers, but only in Him; if they command what He has forbidden, we must fear God and disobey the King."<sup>x</sup> The problems of delimiting the respective spheres of competency was carefully avoided, but in test cases who could doubt that Puritans would uphold the voice of God against the civil ruler, as they did in fact? They looked face to face upon God, and required no message from the past, nor from general human practice, nor reasons based on expediency. The genuine Puritan was a man who sincerely believed that he had heard God speak to him and had received, not by his own reason but through God's grace, a revelation of the divine will and purpose. Nothing in the world could convince him that he was not justified in his belief. He would uphold his conscience against all opposition.<sup>§</sup> The determination of the limits of religion and of truth in religion was a matter for him alone with God, irrespective of the opinions of any ruler.

The greatness of Hooker's work depends primarily on the fact that wittingly or unwittingly he came to the

---

(x) Fairbairn in C.M.H. Vol. II, p. 358.

(§) Cf. T.C. I.13. and Scott Pearson p. 478.



root of the Puritan problem and stated his own case so as to make it clear that the controversy dealt with matters deeper than even the interpretation of Scripture. His predecessors in argument had not realised this. They had taken as their starting-point Bishop Jewel's dictum,<sup>x</sup> and sought to demonstrate that the Church of England satisfied its conditions, declaring that the Puritans were wrong in describing their scheme of discipline as biblical<sup>(14)</sup>. The difficulty was for them one of interpretation of Scripture. Hooker outflanked the Puritans by refusing to base his arguments on the Bible alone. It was not because he thought that the constitution of the Church of England was unscriptural, for he definitely challenged the Puritans on their own ground<sup>(15)</sup>. He pointed to a weak link in the Puritan argument from Scripture. Puritans did not make plain the way by which they came to know the Bible to be the absolute revelation of God's will. Hooker traced the authority of Scripture in the first place to the authority of the Church<sup>(16)</sup>, for the Bible was not self-evidently the complete word of God<sup>(17)</sup>, and required some outside testimony to its validity. Once that testimony had been accepted, by

---

(x) Cf. p164 above.

study "the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it."<sup>18</sup>

The Puritan might however still plead the inner light given by God's grace. Hooker sought to meet this point by outlining a different conception of God and His relation to the universe, in some ways less, in others greater, than that of the Puritan mind. God was not an arbitrary potentate, working all things according to an inscrutable will. Hooker's fundamental principle was of orderliness, guided and directed by fixed rules<sup>§</sup>. Law reigned throughout the universe. Even God was, as it were, under Law. He had in some way limited Himself, limited the extent to which He could apply His powers, because of the eternal purpose which was part of God Himself<sup>(18)</sup>. God was a rational being. This conception of God is fundamental in Hooker's mind and thought, and it lay behind most of his reasoning and argument.

As God was thus brought nearer human ken, so man was exalted and brought closer to God. The light of reason in man was a spark of the fire of divine reason<sup>(19)</sup>. Man and God were not separated by such an infinite barrier as was postulated by the Puritan theory. Though the ways

---

(18) Hooker B.P. III.viii.14.

(§) Cf. op. cit. I.ii.1.

of God were altogether beyond full human understanding<sup>(20)</sup>, especially beyond the comprehension of any individual, yet reason could claim rightly to search out some little of the ways of God by its own unaided light. Nevertheless a man could never speak with certainty of God from his own experience, unless his evidence were authenticated by a miracle.<sup>21</sup> The will of man was free, but liable to err. Individual reason was slack and frail and slothful in its quest for that absolute good which was to be the test of life<sup>(21)</sup>. So, although human reason as a whole was exalted, individual opinion was depreciated, - the exact reversal of the Puritan attitude, which asserted the individual revelation over the perverseness of the world. For the Puritan mere human reason could do nothing, but faith guided by the Spirit could reveal all. For Hooker, faith together with reason could reveal just as much as individual salvation required, but not the complete truth which was God. For the Puritan each individual was a mirror in which, when properly cleansed and adjusted, the very image of God was reflected. For Hooker the world was rather a mosaic in which, when every individual piece was properly placed, God was revealed, each contributing its tiny quota to the great whole.

---

(\*) Cf. op. cit. VII, xiv. 11.

"The general and perpetual voice of men is as the sentence of God himself. For that which all men have at all times learned, Nature herself must needs have taught; and God being the author of Nature, her voice is but his instrument."<sup>22</sup>

Moreover for Hooker God's handiwork was to be traced in many ways. God's laws were not confined to Scripture: God was not a haughty emperor who had made His will known once for all. God's laws formed a complexity revealed in the many realms of nature, in the working of the universe, in the ways of all living creatures, in the operations of the human mind as it faced the problems of individual and social life: in all these Hooker found the voice of God as well as in Scripture, and perhaps in direct revelation<sup>(22)</sup>. God was rational: all things worked according to some reason, and something of the divine reason was revealed in and to man thus. Within the realm of human action again there were different laws, and each action had its appropriate law assigned to it by God. "There are in men operations, some natural, some rational, some supernatural, some politic, some finally ecclesiastical: which if we measure not each by his own proper law, whereas the things themselves are so different,

---

(22) Hooker E.P. I. viii.3.



there will be in our understanding and judgment of them confusion<sup>¶</sup>." Most laws were thus mediated to men through life: what Hooker calls the "revealed Laws of God," "Supernatural Laws", covered but a part of the whole great field of law. But all Law was ultimately derivable from God. So in place of one flat standard for God's dealings with men Hooker postulated a regular hierarchy of dealings direct and indirect, compulsory and voluntary, permanent and temporary, yet all included under the definition of law<sup>(23)</sup> and derived from God. God had not made express provision against all eventualities. His laws were not necessarily static and unalterable: any that depended on circumstances might require to be altered, even though they were of divine origin<sup>(24)</sup>. Human action, being free, might require new rules for its guidance from time to time, if the original eternal end set by God for Himself before all ages was to be realised. It was right for men to provide for themselves laws as best they could, for "nature itself teacheth laws and statutes to live by."<sup>§</sup> The result was that Hooker had plainly to contradict the fundamental contention of his opponents. When he tried to work it into his scheme, the best construction

---

(¶) Op. cit. I.xvi.5.

(§) Hooker E.P.I.x.1.

he could put upon their guiding principle was this:

"Examine, sift and resolve their alleged proofs, till you come to the very root from whence they spring, the heart wherein their strength lieth; and it shall clearly appear unto any man of judgment, that the most which can be inferred upon such plenty of divine testimonies is only this, That some things which they maintain, as far as some men can probably conjecture, do seem to have been out of Scripture not absurdly gathered."<sup>¶</sup> God had revealed clearly just as much as was required for the salvation of man, but he did not thus prohibit sources of law, other than Scripture, of equal value.<sup>§</sup>

Hooker's theology, his view of the Cosmos, was the natural concomitant of the acceptance of a graded system of society, where tradition and institutions and historical continuity would count for much. The exercise of human reason had a divine sanction. Reason lay behind all government and authority, hence it was that the individual was subordinated to the society. The authority of the collected wisdom of the ages was to take precedence of any individual opinion, unless the latter could be proved beyond doubt to be justified. The "law of public reason"

---

(¶) op. cit. II.vii.9.

(§) cf. op. cit. I.xii.3.

took precedence of "the law of private reason,"<sup>(25)</sup> otherwise the great and divine principle of orderliness would be flouted. Thus the individual was subordinated to the society, which acted through its duly constituted heads. Conscience was not the final authority: Hooker would have had the Puritans suppress their opinions: he could not conceive that the mere word of an individual, unsupported by any clear proof, could be valid against the authority of the State, supported by the evidence of learning and tradition<sup>(26)</sup>. In this part of his argument Hooker made little real advance on previous opposition to the Puritans. It was their individualism, their faith in their own light, that called forth the fiercest attacks on their position. The decrying of individual opinions was the usual argument against Puritan ministers, wherever they were found<sup>(27)</sup>. What Hooker did do was to provide a reasoned basis for the Anglican position, to express in careful language the case of the government against obstinate offenders. What he could not accomplish was the conversion to his views of the Puritans. He might puzzle and perplex them, but he could not penetrate to the foundations of their belief. His views seemed to them heretical: they appealed to the Thirty-Nine Articles against him, and accused him of being tainted with Popery<sup>H</sup>. He could not reason with people

---

(\*) Cf. The "Christian Letter" of 1599.

who could not understand his appeal to reason, as appeared in the diverse accounts given by Travers and himself of an interview between them during their controversy. What Hooker termed at best "probabilities", the Puritans believed to be the very voice of God, to be obeyed at all costs. To them Hooker's arguments might seem to be of that wisdom of the world with which was classed the flesh and the devil. In the suppression of such genuine earnest Puritanism Whitgift, Bancroft, the Star Chamber and the High Commission were more important than arguments: but for the conversion of those who were not whole-heartedly possessed of Puritan ideas, and for the rallying of the growing sentiment in favour of the Elizabethan Church Settlement, Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity" was an excellent instrument. It was a work for the times: it remains a work for all time, a sure proof of its genuine and abiding worth, while the writings of Elizabethan Puritans are accessible only in the recesses of large libraries, or in reprints made mainly for the benefit of historical students. Puritanism had a contribution to make to the national life, but its real glories are not in the reign of Elizabeth, though we cannot deny value to the seedling which developed into the tree which bore such rich fruit in English history.



It is in their attitude and not in their doctrines that historians and political scientists find the justification of Cartwright and the Puritans. The true Puritan theory was narrow, rigorous, and autocratic in tendency. The rulers of England saw rightly that it involved the question of ultimate authority: the conflicts between state organisation and individual Puritans proved the truth of their fears. Uniformity and conscience would always come into collision, so long as the uniformity demanded was that of the Church of England, and the conscience of the individual was nourished on Puritan arguments. The 'Word of God', as interpreted by the school of Cartwright, involved inevitably a conflict with the authority of the state as represented by the Queen and her officers; in fact it infringed the royal prerogative as Elizabeth understood it. Yet that which made them obnoxious to the government, their division of allegiance and insistence upon a higher allegiance than national loyalty, has become their fame, and, as it were, bestowed a halo upon their memories which would not be conferred upon the historical characters. Cartwright's "courageous and triumphant stand in behalf of his conscientious convictions and the beneficial results that flowed from it, furnish an instance of the influence of Puritanism on civil as well as

Dear Sir,

I

have payment  
ended 30th S

religious freedom."<sup>¶</sup> "He stood indeed for liberty of conscience, not because he believed in its intrinsic value, but because he bravely endeavoured to secure it for himself. He suffered for his conscientious convictions and, by showing that honest tenacity of belief and purpose cannot be subverted by external coercion, he unwittingly paved the way for the establishment of civil and religious freedom. He was greater than he knew."<sup>§</sup>

And what of the ultimate solution? A considerable step towards it was dimly foreshadowed by one Puritan at least. In a criticism of Whitgift's "Articles" of 1583 he animadverted on the restriction to one of the number of translations of the Bible in use<sup>(28)</sup>, pointing out that such a quest for unity would defeat its own object. Of the critical demand for subscription to the Books of Common Prayer and Ordering and the Articles of Religion, made in the interests of uniformity, he declared, "Such an uniformitie.... as shall be voide of difference of opinion never yet was, nor never shall be founde, but onelie in ignorance."<sup>+</sup> From that position the step to a recognition of liberty of conscience and toleration was not far, but it meant a reversal of deeply rooted

---

(¶) Scott Pearson p. 329.

(§) Scott Pearson, p. 406.

(+) 2nd Part. Reg. Vol. I. p. 189.

conceptions, and was accomplished only after much tribulation and anguish.

Yet the problem still remains. As long as social authorities, national, civic, or communal, are concerned with matters which can be held to be subject to divine regulation, so long will the Puritans of each generation find their loyalties divided. A solution seems unattainable in practice, yet Hooker may point to the way which offers most promise. However absolutist he may appear in parts of his argument, however much he yielded to established authority, it must be remembered that he started from a conception of true authority as self-limited. Perfect peace in human societies will come only when all authorities in them recognise the proper bounds of their authority and limit themselves freely and willingly. Only when all groups and individuals accept of themselves common principles and laws, and voluntarily bind themselves without constraint, can each and all be truly free.

word and the Holy Spirit

Halt. All. always

4. "Let the Spirit of God

both / which is given

and stretched out

("Exhort." vol. 1. p. 10)

3.

# NOTES TO "THE ULTIMATE ISSUE".

---

1. "The controversy is, what part of it [the Reformation] is agreeable to the word of God, and what is not; also, what it is to be agreeable to the word of God." (Whitgift, I. p. 93).
2. Thus it was that importance was attached to the particular translation which was adopted. Sixteenth century versions of the Bible were not mere translations, but included elementary commentaries. The Puritans took the "Geneva Bible" as their standard, and asked for its use on several occasions, e.g. 2nd Part Reg. Vol. I. pp. 73n, 176, 185.
3. "The word of God is the onely starre, whereby this life is." [Travers] ("Eccles. Disc." p. 90).  
 "Seeing we have now in these times no other meanes to be certified of the will of God, besides his written word and the holy Scriptures." (op. cit. p. 91). (Cf. Mult. Al. also).
4. "Let the word of the sternall be iudge betweene both / which is goulde and silver / and which is dresse and stubble: which is corne / and which is chaffe." ("Exhort." fol. B. ii verso). (Cf. Mult. Al. also).



5. "A man may reason bothe wayes necessarily. The Lorde hathe commaunded / it shoulde be in hys church: therefore it must. And of the other side / he hath not commaunded: therefore it must not be." [Cartwright]. (T.C.I. pp. 25, 26).

"They deceive them selves, standing so much upon thys word repugnant, as though nothyng were repugnant, or agaynste the word of God, but that whych is expresly forbidden by plain commaundement." [Field and Wilcox]. ("Ad. Parlt." fol. B.i recto).

6. "I saye that the word of God contayneth the direction of all things pertayning to the church / yea of whatsoeuer things can fall into <sup>any</sup> part of mans life." [Cartwright]. (T.C.I. p. 26).

"The word of God directeth a man in all his actions." [Cartwright]. (Op. cit. I.p.27).

7. "We say the worde is above the church / then surely it is above the Englishe church." ("Second Adm." p. 7).

"If we examine everye thyng done in thys Church of God in Englande by the worde of God / and holde that whiche is good / though the lawe be offended / that lawe is to be reformed / and not we to be punished." (Op. cit. p. 9).

"If they will still rowle the stone of mans power, to alter and change this order of God, let them shew how men can take away that which God hath set in his Church.... If it be a shame to preferre mans wisdom before the wisdom of God, at the least let them declare by what authoritie they will compell the church to refuse the strong arme of God, for the weake arme of flesh and blood. [Fenner]. ("A parte etc." pp. 426, 427).

8. "The whole substaunce of the ordinarie gouernment of the Church, that is to say, the vnchangeable lawes of the holy things..... is prescribed of God in his holy worde, as a perpetuall lawe vnto his Church. And although euerie particular rite and order (which are variable according to the circumstance, bee not so particularly mentioned) yet are they by certaine generall rules so limited and prescribed, that no church can vse them at their pleasure, but ought to frame them within the boundes set vnto them of God." [Fenner]. (Op. cit. p. 424).

"Eythre you of the Parliament muste take order to have all reformed according to the worde of God / ..... or else they to bring your reformation to the trial of the word of God / and to overthrowe by the same all that we say / and al that the other of the best reformed churches doe use. Well they may conferre and yeelde / for never shall they overthrow the truthe which we

utter / and which the reformed churches doe practice."  
 ("Second Adm." pp. 37, 38).

9. "I cal therefore Ecclesiastical Discipline, the  
 12. pollicie of the Church of Christ, ordeyned and appointed  
 of God, for the good administration and government of the  
 same..... I make.... God the Author of Discipline (where-  
 upon it followeth that we have to fetch the rules thereof  
 from no other fountaines but from the holy scriptures),"  
 [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." pp. 5,6).

"As touching oure doctrine, we are out of doubte: it  
 agreeth with Gods word: and I think it will not be hard  
 for us to shew, <sup>t</sup><sub>y</sub> <sup>e</sup><sub>y</sub> simplicitie of <sup>e</sup><sub>y</sub> ceremonies of this  
 church..... and the whole order of oure Discipline, are  
 13. drawne out of the same fountaine." [Beza]. ("Ad. Parlt."  
 fol. C v verso.)

10. "This task which God by these treatises offereth  
 you." (Op. cit. fol A. i. verso).

14. "Our God, who..... hath by us revealed unto you at  
 this present, the sinceritie and simplicitie of his Gos-  
 pel." [Field and Wilcox]. (Op. cit. fol. A ii recto).

11. "Neither yet iudgyng our selves, so exactly to have  
 sette out that state of a church reformed, as that noth-  
 ing more coulde be added, or a more perfecte forme and  
 order drawne: for that were greate presumption, to

arrogate so much unto our selves, seeing that as we are but weake and simple soules." [Field and Wilcox].

("Ad. Parlt." fol. A vii verso).

12. "The Church of God is a company or congregation of the faithful called and gathered out of the world by the preaching of the Gospel, who following and embracing true religion, do in one unitie of Spirit strengthen and comfort one another, dayly growing and increasing in true faith, framing their lives, governments, orders and ceremonies according to the word of God." [Field and Wilcox]. ("2nd Part Reg." Vol. I, p. 86).
13. "It is meete that all the princes and monarches of the world should give up their scepters and crowns unto him, whom God hath made and appointed the heire of his kingdom, and Lord of heaven and earth." [Travers]. ("Eccles. Disc." p. 194).
14. "I do not oppose men's authority to the authority of the Holy Ghost, and to the reasons that are grounded out of the scripture; but I oppose them to your authority, and to your reasons, who spurn against that order which the Holy Ghost hath placed in the church, and most shamefully abuse the scripture to maintain your errors." [Whitgift]. (Whitgift. II. p. 405).



17. "I doe therefore say and offer in the name of the learned..... that it is taken by vs for an vndoubted trueth, the contrary whereof, by no prooffe we doe assure our selues can be shewed, that there are not set downe in particular by scripture, or by necessarie collection to be gathered, all circumstances of pollice, gouernment. Discipline, and ceremonies necessary and vniformally to bee vsed in euery seuerall Church." ("A parte etc." p. 421).

"It cannot be proued, that any set and exact particular forme thereof, is recommended to vs by the word of God." (Op. cit. p. 422). [Cosin, in the "Answer to the Abstract", quoted by Fenner].

15. "If we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us and the strongest against them were to hold even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of church polity which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all churches, to all times." (Hooker E.P. III.x.8). (Cf. III. iv and III. xi. 16, 20).

16. The first outward motive leading men so to esteem of the Scripture is the authority of God's Church." (Op. cit. III. viii. 14).

17. "Of things necessary the very chiefest is to know what books we are bound to esteem holy; which point is <sup>the</sup> confessed impossible for/Scripture itself to teach." (Op. cit. I. xiv.1).
18. "The works and operations of God have Him both for their worker, and for the law whereby they are wrought. The being of God is a kind of law to his working: for that perfection which God is, giveth perfection to that he doth." (Op. cit. I.ii.2).
- "In the working of that first cause,... Counsel is used, Reason followed, a Way observed; that is to say, constant Order and Law is kept; whereof itself must needs be author unto itself. Otherwise it should have some worthier and higher to direct it, and so could not itself be the first. Being the first, it can have no other than itself to be the author of that law which it willingly worketh by. God therefore is a law both to himself, and to all other things besides..... God worketh nothing without cause.... That and nothing else is done by God, which to leave undone were not so good.
- "If therefore it be demanded, why God having power and ability infinite, the effects notwithstanding of that power are all so limited as we see they are: the reason hereof is the end which he hath proposed, and the law whereby his wisdom hath stinted the effects of his power

in such sort, that it doth not work infinitely, but correspondently unto that end for which it worketh." (Op. cit. I.ii.3).

"They err therefore who think that of the will of God to do this or that there is no reason besides his will. Many times no reason known to us; but that there is no reason thereof I judge it most unreasonable to imagine." (Op. cit. I.ii.5).

19. "The light of natural understanding, wit, and reason, is from God; he it is which thereby doth illuminate every man entering into the world." (Op. cit. III.ix.3).  
(Cf. III.viii.9).

20. "Whatsoever is done with counsel or wise resolution hath of necessity some reason why it should be done, albeit that reason be to us in some things so secret, that it forceth the wit of man to stand..... amazed thereat... That law eternal which God himself hath made to himself... how should either men or angels be able perfectly to behold? The book of this law we are neither able nor worthy to open and look into." (Hooker E.P.I.ii.5).

21. "There is in the Will of man, naturally that freedom, whereby it is apt to take or refuse any particular object whatsoever being presented unto it..... Reason therefore may rightly discern the thing which is good, and yet the

24. Will of man not incline itself thereunto, as oft as the prejudice of sensible experience doth oversway." (Op. cit. I.vii.6).

"In doing evil, we prefer a less good before a greater, the greatness whereof is by reason investigable and may be known." (Op. cit. I.vii.7).

22. "Now that law which, as it is laid up in the bosom of God, they call Eternal, receiveth according unto the different kinds of things which are subject unto it different and sundry kinds of names. That part of it which ordereth natural agents we call usually Nature's law, that which Angels do clearly behold..... is a law Celestial and heavenly; the law of Reason, that which bindeth creatures reasonable in this world, and with which by reason they may most plainly perceive themselves bound; that which bindeth them, and is not known but by special revelation from God, Divine law; Human law, that which out of the law either of reason or of God men probably gathering to be expedient, they make it a law." [The theme is developed throughout Book I]. (Op. cit. I.iii.1).

23. "A law.... generally taken, is a directive rule unto goodness of operation." (Op. cit. I.viii.4).



24. "Positive laws are either permanent or else changeable, according as the matter itself is concerning which they were first made. Whether God or man be the maker of them, alteration they so far forth admit, as the matter doth exact." (Op. cit. I.xv.1). (Cf. V. lxxxi.4).
25. "The public power of all societies is above every soul contained in the same societies. And the principal use of that power is to give laws unto all that are under it; which laws in such case we must obey, unless there be reason shewed which may necessarily enforce that the law of Reason or of God doth enjoin the contrary. Because except our own private and but probable resolutions be by the law of public determinations overruled, we take away all possibility of sociable life in the world." (Hooker E.P.I.xvi.5).
- "By following the law of private reason, where the law of public should take place, they breed disturbance." [Of the Puritans]. (Op. cit. I.xvi.6).
26. "Ways of peaceable conclusion there are, but these two certain: the one, a sentence of judicial decision given by authority thereto appointed within ourselves; the other, the like kind of sentence given by a more universal authority." (Op. cit. Pref. vi.2).

"That which you [Puritans] are persuaded of, ye have it no otherwise than by your own only probable collection." (Op. cit. Pref. vi.3).

"This persuasion ought (we say) to be fully settled in their hearts; that in litigious and controverted causes of such quality, the will of God is to have them do whatsoever the sentence of judicial and final decision shall determine, yea, though it seem in their private opinion to swerve utterly from that which is right..... For if God be not the author of confusion but of peace, then can he not be the author of our refusal, but of our contentment, to stand unto some definitive sentence; without which almost impossible it is that either we should avoid confusion, or ever hope to attain peace." (loc. cit.)

"As for the orders which are established, sith equity and reason, the law of nature, God and man, do all favour that which is in being, till orderly judgment of decision be given against it; it is but justice to exact of you, and perverseness in you it should be to deny, thereunto your willing obedience." (Op. cit. Pref. vi.5).

"Not that I judge it a thing allowable for men to observe those laws which in their hearts they are steadfastly persuaded to be against the law of God: but your persuasion in this case ye are all bound for the time to suspend..... Of peace and quietness there is not any way possible, unless the probable voice of every entire

society or body politic overrule all private of like nature in the same body. Which thing effectually proveth, that God, being the author of peace and not of confusion in the church, must needs be author of those men's peaceable resolutions, who concerning these things have determined with themselves to think and do as the church they are of decreeth, till they see necessary cause enforcing them to the contrary." (Hooker E.P. Pre. vi.6).

27. In Sussex the Archdeacon of Lewes, in the course of an examination of certain non-subscribing ministers in 1583 "added further sarcastice speach to this effect - The queene and hir counsell, tharchb. and other bb. of the relme, both the universities and all the learned of the land thinke this necessarye to be done for uniformitie and consent, and here cometh in Mr Bingham, without any degree, and a few other, and make doubte of the matter and refuse to subscribe." (2nd Part. Reg. Vol. I, p. 210).
28. "I know that for the countenance of this article unitie is pretended, which is the shadow of all the broiles latelie stirred in Germany, and I feare me will worke as much mischief in England." (Op. cit. Vol. I, p. 186).